

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



**A Poet for all Seasons
a Study of the Writings of Gómez Manrique**

Earle, Gisèle

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This electronic theses or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Title: A Poet for all Seasons: a Study of the Writings of Gómez Manrique

Author: Gisèle Earle

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENSE AGREEMENT



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

You are free to:

- Share: to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**A Poet for all Seasons:
a Study of the Writings of Gómez Manrique**

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

at King's College London

Gisèle Hilary Earle.

Abstract

Although Gómez Manrique left a corpus of over one hundred poems, there is still only one short monograph on his work, *Introducción a la poesía de Gómez Manrique* by Kenneth Scholberg, and the brief introduction by Francisco Vidal González to his edition of the poet's work. Scholarship on his output has otherwise consisted mainly of articles on just one poem. This thesis is an attempt to place his work in the context of fifteenth-century society taking into account its social and political climate. His military career, political activity in the conflicts in the Iberian peninsula, and his administrative posts, together with the fact that he mixed with many of the most influential members of Castilian society, are all important aspects of his life, an awareness of which contributes to our understanding of much of his work. While the main editions of Gómez Manrique (Paz y Melia and Vidal González) divide his work into categories such as his love poetry, debate poetry, moral works and his political writing, here it is argued that these areas of his work do not fall neatly into discrete categories as there is much overlap among them. For this reason an attempt is made to trace the development of his verse and prose within a chronological framework as far as this is possible, taking into account a certain duality in his thought that suggests a rather complex character who is striving to make his voice heard in the turbulent society in which he lived. What binds the different elements of his work together to a large extent is a strong didactic purpose, driven by both Christian and Stoic teaching and Gómez Manrique's desire to influence those in a position of power in Castilian society by means of the various literary forms that were cultivated by his contemporaries.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to a number of people who have helped me on my way while I have been working on this thesis. Firstly, my thanks should go to what was then the Department of Spanish and Latin American Studies at King's for accepting me to follow the MA course. After spending my whole working life as a schoolteacher I was on the one hand eager to widen my knowledge of Spanish literature, but at the same time felt diffident as to whether I was capable of graduate work. I am especially grateful to Professor Catherine Boyle for encouraging me to apply to King's back in 2005. I surprised myself when I found such satisfaction in reading fifteenth-century Spanish literature in the classes given by Professors Julian Weiss and Robert Archer. It is to Robert in particular that I owe my greatest debt of gratitude for his wise, patient and tactful guidance over the last five years, especially in the final months of writing up my work when he read my final draft so painstakingly. As my secondary supervisor, Julian has also offered some valuable hints.

I have been very blessed by enjoying access not only to the Maughan Library at King's, but also to the wonderful collections of the Bodleian and Taylorian libraries in Oxford. Dr. Julia Walworth, librarian of Merton College, allowed me to examine the 1548 edition of Juan de Mena containing Olivares's glosses and continuation of the *Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntad*. In Portugal José Chitas at the Biblioteca Pública de Évora was equally helpful in letting me read the only known copy of the 1505 edition of the same work. The staff of the Palacio Real Library in Madrid were also very obliging.

My friend, Cynthia Hall, helped me initially to format the Appendix, but I am even more indebted to her husband, Dr. Anthony Hall, who spent considerable time in explaining how to perfect this and then solved some other really difficult problems of word-processing.

Lastly I must thank my friends and family for all their encouragement. In particular I should mention my daughter Lucy, my son Benjamin and his wife, Anna Linton, as well as my husband Tom, all of whom have given me much moral support.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
Introduction	5
Chapter I Learning the Craft: Courtly Love Poetry and Related Writings (c.1430-c.1455).....	19
Chapter II Two Elegies for Knights (1458-1460)	54
Chapter III Engaging with Juan de Mena: a Comparison of Three Continuations of the <i>Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntat</i>	71
Chapter IV Cut and Thrust: Requests and Responses (c.1458-c.1470)	98
Chapter V Matters of State	153
Chapter VI Family Consolatory and Devotional Writing	185
Conclusion.....	204
Appendix	210
Bibliography.....	238

Introduction

The huge quantity of fifteenth-century Castilian poetry in the form we know it from Dutton's seven-volume edition testifies above all to the dominance of verse as a literary form accessible to a great many men who possessed varying levels of poetic talent. This was partly because, as we may judge from the remarks of the Marqués de Santillana in his *Proemio e Carta* to the condestable de Portugal, there was a perception that verse was a superior form to prose: 'me esfuerso a dezir el metro ser antes en tienpo e de mayor perfección que la soluta prosa' (Santillana 2003: 645). It was also doubtless because verse was a form of composition accessible to a great many men who all possessed the basic skills for it but among whom levels of poetic talent varied enormously. Few fifteenth-century poets stand out alongside the influential Marqués himself or the towering figure of Juan de Mena, but they are, with rare exceptions, competent versifiers who were able to use poetry for their particular ends and to do so in the relative certainty that their contemporaries would take the trouble to listen or read their compositions. And in a sense it is the generally undistinguished quality of this body of verse that points to its importance in contemporary terms. Every man with a basic training in classical rhetoric, an acquaintance with a few metres and stanza-forms, and the standard poetic genres could turn out verses, and in some social contexts was expected to do so.

Writing for aspiring poets at the end of the fourteenth century in one of the other great traditions of the Peninsula, Lluís d'Averçó translated, in his *Torcimany*, a large part of an earlier Provençal poetic manual, the *Flors del gay saber*, into Catalan, believing that, anyone who learned the three basic rules of versification could write acceptable verses: 'La primera cosa es que aprima l'enteniment, la segona cosa es que adoba la subtileza, e la terça cosa es que entriqua l'enginy, en tant que per aquesta sciencia, pot hom dictar altament en sentencia, plana en scriptura e fina en art, per las quals cosas se seguex verdadera intelhigencia dels dictatz, axí en sentencia com en scriptura, com en art' (d'Averçó 1956: 15). A similar happy belief that you did not have to be born a poet to write, but could make yourself one if you chose, must surely have been held in Castile. And there were good reasons for taking the trouble to learn the tricks of the trade: verse was an accessible way of making your voice heard, together with your ideas and viewpoint when the occasion required it.

The importance of the work of Gómez Manrique (c.1412-1490) lies precisely in the obvious fact that he was not a Juan de Mena or an Ausiàs March, but rather a distinguished example of that great mass of versifiers who wrote ceaselessly in all kinds

of social and political contexts during the troubled central decades of the fifteenth century. His work perhaps takes us closer than that of more famous practitioners to the basic function of verse for people of his class and time. It is the aim of this thesis to describe this function by analysing in detail all his known work in the contexts in which it was written.

Gómez Manrique lived and wrote close to those holding the reins of power throughout his life, and addressed in his poems people of enormous political influence as well as a wide range of others from lower social strata. For few writers of the period can such an overwhelming case be made for studying his work in the context of the social, economic and political background in which it was produced.¹ A considerable amount can be learned about the people Gómez Manrique addresses in his work and his intentions in so doing, from chronicles such as the *Memorial de diversas hazañas* by Diego Valera, Alfonso Palencia's *Gesta hispaniensia ex annalibus suorum dierum*, the *Crónica anónima de Enrique IV de Castilla* and Enríquez del Castillo's *Crónica de Enrique IV*, as well as from historical studies that draw on these and other sources. I refer to these at several points. The chronicles can tell us much too about the society in which Gómez Manrique lived and the same is true of the verse and prose works of writers contemporary to Gómez Manrique who treat similar subjects. One example of this is Gómez Manrique's poem to Diego Arias Dávila whose unpopularity led him to become the butt of several satirical poems such as the *Coplas de la Panadera* and the *Coplas de Provincial*. Similarly, when considering the advice given to the infanta Isabel in his *Regimiento de príncipes* much can be gleaned about the attitudes he shared to some extent with others towards women from both Martín de Córdoba's *Jardín de nobles doncellas* and Fray Íñigo de Mendoza's *Dechado a la muy escelente reina doña Isabel*. Since he frequently engaged in verse dialogue with other poets, I have studied some of the poems alongside other writers of the same period in order to throw into relief his own contributions, notably his continuation of Mena's *Coplas de los siete pecados mortales*, also completed by Pero Guillén de Segovia and Jerónimo de Olivares. The way in which Gómez Manrique's work relates to all this is much more meaningful if, as I explain below, we try to establish some kind of working chronological framework for his own production.

The importance of the historical context to Gómez Manrique's literary production has been recognized from the earliest substantial piece of scholarly work,

¹ Mark Johnston makes a strong case for considering the historical context and the social and political implications of the *cancionero* lyric (Johnston 1998: 236).

Antonio Paz y Melia's, edition of 1885-1886. He opens his introduction by highlighting the poet's use of the modesty topos and quoting from the final lines of his letter to the Conde de Benavente which accompanies his collected poems. Having granted the Conde's request, the poet writes, 'Suplico que [...] quiera mandar tener este libro cerrado en su cámara' (Gómez Manrique 1885: I, viii), an appeal that would seem to have been heeded since the book (MP3) was only found four hundred years later in the Palacio Real in Madrid. Around the same time Paz y Melia found another manuscript of Gómez Manrique's work in the Biblioteca Nacional (MN23) and he expresses satisfaction that the publication of his edition will mean that 'los que, admirando ya el autor en la media docena de composiciones que de él se conservaban, podrán conocerlo bajo nuevos aspectos en el centenar que hoy se imprime' (viii)

Paz y Melia continues by giving some details of Gómez Manrique's aristocratic lineage and his family connections with the Mendozas and Castilian royalty through his mother, Leonor de Castilla. The rest of his introduction consists largely of an account of the main political events in which the poet was involved, emphasizing that there were three main phases in his life. As a young man he fought with the infantes de Aragón against Álvaro de Luna and Juan II. After the latter's death in 1454 he and many nobles initially supported Enrique IV until disillusionment with his rule set in and they swore allegiance to his young half-brother, Alfonso. Finally, after the premature death of Alfonso, Gómez Manrique backed Isabel's claim to the throne in preference to that of Juana and was instrumental in arranging Isabel's marriage to Fernando. He records a number of the military campaigns in which the poet participated, mentioning his attempts to secure peace during the many upheavals that erupted during his lifetime and, importantly, his success in delaying the establishment of the Inquisition in Toledo in 1484, by which time he was governor of that city. This summary of the important events that took place during the poet's life is an extremely useful one and he refers to the historians, Palencia, Salazar and Zurita as his sources. He makes no attempt to analyse their content or style, offering an excuse for his lack of criticism: 'Estudiada como está hasta la saciedad la poesía castellana del siglo XV, pedantesco sería entrar en el análisis crítico de las de esta obra' (xxxii), a rather surprising statement since he is publishing a large body of material that has lain unnoticed for four centuries. He does, however, disagree with Amador de los Ríos whom he quotes as saying of Gómez Manrique, 'en vano sería buscar en él la ternura del sentimiento' (xxxii-xxxiii), because he finds both the elegy for Garcilaso and the *consolatoria* for Juana de Mendoza moving. He singles out and quotes in its entirety one short love poem, 'El corazón se me fue' as a 'prueba

inmediata de extraordinaria delicadeza de sentimiento y singular gracia en la expresión' (xxxiii).

The appendix to this edition contains some useful material, notably an account by Pero Guillén de Segovia of the siege and capture of Canales in 1474 in which Gómez Manrique distinguished himself when leader of archbishop Carrillo's private army (II, 308-314). A letter to Gómez Manrique from Isabel I, urging him to leave his post in Toledo and to go to the court at Valladolid to comfort his sick wife is reproduced, as is his will. Of particular interest is the inventory of his library that allows us to see the books that he had in his possession. He also offers a little information about some of the recipients of the poet's writings. Finally he quotes some lines from various poems of Gómez Manrique that he thinks tell us something about the man himself: 'dan mucha luz, así sobre lo que de su suerte sentía, como sobre las aspiraciones de su gran ánimo' (II, 341).

There is no further work on Gómez Manrique until Kenneth Scholberg's *Introducción a la poesía de Gómez Manrique* in 1984. He groups the poems into six categories, 'una clasificación sin duda arbitraria' (1), devoting six pages to Gómez Manrique's love poetry which, he points out, amounts to nearly forty out of over one hundred compositions. It is made clear that the theme of courtly love, derived from the Provençal tradition, is a mere pretext for writing poetry, that the women addressed probably never existed, and if they did, there was no passion on the part of the poet.

The following section concerns *Las breves poesías de ocasión* which includes all the *preguntas y respuestas*, both light-hearted and more serious. No mention is made of Gómez Manrique's presence in the household of the archbishop of Toledo, Alfonso Carrillo, when the more reflective dialogues are thought to have taken place with other members of Carrillo's retinue. Rather surprisingly, Scholberg calls another group of poems, which includes the exchanges with Juan de Valladolid, *Las obras humorísticas*, although he recognizes that for Gómez Manrique 'la vis cómica no era su punto fuerte' (20), and that this humour is at the expense of others, usually of lower social status.

The *consolatorias* for Juana Manrique and Juana de Mendoza are grouped with the elegies for Garcilaso de la Vega and the marqués de Santillana. Regarding the poem for Juana Manrique, it is noted that Gómez Manrique alludes to Fortune as a classical figure but explains it in Christian terms. The influence of both Mena and Santillana is noted in a summary of the *Planto* written for the marqués. Scholberg notes a disparity in the length of the different sections of the *consolatoria* for Juana de Mendoza and remarks that we cannot say why Gómez Manrique states that he believed that his sins

were the cause of his children's deaths, but that the reader is left 'conmoverido por la sinceridad de sus palabras y la profundidad de su emoción' (30).

In a section on *Las obras didáctico-políticas* Scholberg finds that the difficulty of the *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación* lies in the 'enumeración caótica que forma el cuerpo de la obra y que a primera vista tal vez deje desconcertado al lector' (31), but thinks that this reflects the chaos of contemporary society. The *Coplas para Arias Dávila* are admired for 'su unidad y constancia de tono' (35); nevertheless they have a pessimism that underlines the fleeting nature of the material world. Gómez Manrique's patriotism and hope for stability is noted in his *Regimiento de príncipes* which seeks to guide Isabel and Fernando on their accession to the throne.

Scholberg points out that with one exception, the *Troba hecho a santo Tomé*, all the religious works focus on the Virgin Mary, the two best known being the *Representación del nacimiento de Nuestro Señor* and the *Lamentaciones fechas para la Semana Santa* since they are the first examples of Castilian theatre apart from a twelfth-century *auto*. Scholberg concludes that the introduction of the personified instruments of the Passion into this play implies that the nativity theme of the *Representación* is used as a vehicle to reinforce the message of human salvation.

If Scholberg's analysis of the content of the poems is rather superficial, the same cannot be said of his treatment in minute detail of their style which occupies more than half the book with thirteen pages devoted to metrics. Examples are given of the many different octosyllabic verse-forms used by Gómez Manrique, such as the *copla castellana* and the *copla mixta*. There is a section on *estranjerismos* in which Scholberg notes the occurrence of words borrowed from French, Arabic, Catalan and Portuguese and another on *cultismos* which are mainly borrowings from Latin (56-58). He suggests that the use of Latinate constructions and hyperbaton were an attempt to elevate Gómez Manrique's poetic style (61-63).

The pages devoted to figures of speech are an excellent guide to analysing the techniques Gómez Manrique employed. Scholberg gives examples of the effective use of antithesis, chiasmus, enjambement, alliteration, anaphora, pleonasm and periphrasis amongst others. In writing about the poet's figurative language he observes that some metaphors and similes are 'consagrados por el tiempo' (82), but others are more original, such as when he speaks of composing poetry in the very concrete terms of carpentry. Scholberg draws attention to the frequent nautical metaphors and similes, particularly in the more serious poems, and to the word 'vedrío' to denote both purity and fragility. Fragility is emphasized also with similes referring to flowers and it is

these images that Scholberg praises: 'donde más brilla su talento evocador es en la creación de imágenes que expresan lo efímero e insustancial de los bienes mundanos' (94).

A major step towards our understanding of Gómez Manrique is the edition of Francisco Vidal González of 2003 which amplifies the political and historical context of his writings. In the introduction to his edition of Gómez Manrique's complete works Vidal González begins by reminding us of the internecine strife amongst the nobility and monarchy that characterized fifteenth-century Castile and into which the poet was born. He gives a full biography of the poet, the early part of which he admits has to be based on supposition, adding details of significant members of his extended family and stressing their ancient lineage and royal connections. He also makes a connection between events in the poet's life and the content of many of his works.

Vidal González adds to what is known of Gómez Manrique's military career. This he takes as beginning when, with three of his brothers, he participated in the capture of Huéscar from the Moors in 1434. The Manrique family were bitterly opposed to Juan II's favourite, Álvaro de Luna, and with the infantes de Aragón were involved in campaigns to weaken his power, a result of which was the imprisonment of Gómez Manrique's father, Pedro in 1437. The fickleness of the nobles with regard to their political allegiances is indicated by the fact that after Pedro regained his freedom, the Manriques and Enrique de Aragón were present in Valladolid in 1440 to welcome Blanca of Navarre on her forthcoming marriage to the future Enrique IV. Vidal González comments, 'Estas aparentes contradicciones son una característica del siglo' (20) and to prove it Gómez Manrique continued to fight in Enrique de Aragón's army until the latter's death in 1445 following the battle of Olmedo. The struggles against Luna continued until his execution in 1453, but in the following year Juan II died and the Manriques and their followers decided to support the new king, Enrique IV.

The introduction continues by recounting that some time after the death of the marqués de Santillana in 1458 Gómez Manrique entered the household of Alfonso Carrillo, the archbishop of Toledo, and became commander of his private army. It was here that Gómez Manrique combined the roles of soldier and poet since a number of scholars and writers were made welcome, some of whom responded to his verses, namely Pero Guillén de Segovia, Juan Álvarez Gato, Rodrigo Cota and Pero Díaz de Toledo amongst others. As already described above, Enrique soon lost favour with a large section of the nobility and in 1465 a group of nobles including the poet and Carrillo took matters into their own hands and dethroned an effigy of Enrique IV in

Ávila and proceeded to crown Enrique's young half-brother, the infante Alfonso as king. Alfonso gained in popularity and sporadic fighting broke out between the two rival camps. After Alfonso's premature death in 1468 his sister, Isabel had no pretensions to follow in her brother's footsteps as a rival to Enrique, but the question of who should succeed him became a pressing one. The choice was between Isabel and the infanta Juana, believed by many to be the daughter of one of Enrique's favourites, Beltrán de la Cueva, rather than the king's daughter. Both Gómez Manrique and Carrillo strongly supported Isabel's claim to the throne and eventually they witnessed Enrique announcing Isabel as his successor at Toros de Guisando in September 1468. Their next task was to arrange the marriage between Isabel and Fernando of Aragon, an event they achieved with considerable stealth in 1469.

Vidal González reminds us that although in 1470 Enrique revoked his statement made at Toros de Guisando, Gómez Manrique worked constantly to promote the cause of Isabel and Fernando by negotiating with those who were hesitant in their support of the couple. When Enrique died in December 1474 Isabel was immediately crowned in the absence of Fernando. Carrillo, who had hoped to be rewarded with a post in the new government, was disappointed and retired to Alcalá de Henares, transferring his allegiance to Afonso V of Portugal who had designs on the Castilian throne. Gómez Manrique was appointed *corregidor* of Toledo in 1477, a mission made difficult the following year by the machinations of Carrillo who plotted with Afonso to unseat his former ally. Gómez Manrique, however, showed both great physical and moral courage by quelling an angry crowd in a speech reported by Fernando del Pulgar and quoted by Vidal González (36), but a peace treaty with Portugal was signed in 1479.

The following year Gómez Manrique and his wife, Juana de Mendoza, suffered the loss of two of their children within four months of each other, a tragedy that inspired him to write his *consolatoria* for Juana who was *camarera* to the queen and therefore spent much of her time at court and away from her husband. Gómez Manrique remained as *corregidor* of Toledo until his death in 1490, maintaining peace in the city, notably avoiding a massacre of *conversos* in 1484, and according to Vidal González, taking 'una posición contraria a la imposición de la Inquisición' (40).

Commenting on the different categories of Gómez Manrique's output, Vidal González observes that although courtly love poetry is not usually considered to reflect true emotions for real people, he finds an expression of 'profunda inspiración y sentimiento' in some of these compositions (44). The religious poetry, mainly dedicated to the Virgin Mary and her redemptory role, occupies another section, the word

‘redención’, according to the editor, being ‘el eje semántico de todos estos poemas’ (52).

Rather surprisingly Vidal González groups a number of poems that are different in tone as *Poesía de circunstancias y satírica* in the same section of his introduction even though some are full of praise for the addressees whilst others, such as the exchanges with Juan de Valladolid, are spiteful in tone. These verse dialogues are considered by the editor to be reminiscent of the Provençal *sirventés* or the Galician-Portuguese *cantigas d’escarnho e de maldezir*.

In the section on the two elegies the point is made that the poem for Garcilaso bears the title *Defunción* since its focus is on the death of the young knight and the stance we need to adopt on such occasions, ‘una actitud cristiana y noble [...] que él (Gómez Manrique) y toda su familia y círculo propiciaban’ (57-58). The poem for Santillana, however, is a *Planto* emphasizing the sorrow that his death has occasioned. Vidal González observes that the *consolatorias* combine elegiac and moral elements. In the case of Juana Manrique the theme of Fortune is uppermost, but the poet encourages his sister to face misfortune stoically. The editor, along with other critics, thinks that the *consolatoria* addressed to Juana de Mendoza, is the last poem Gómez Manrique wrote, begun probably in November 1480 but not completed until 1485.

Two important poems are classed as *Poesía didáctico-moral*, one being the continuation of Mena’s unfinished *Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntad*, to which Gómez Manrique added one hundred and fifty *octavas*. The other is the *Coplas a Diego Arias Dávila*, recognized ‘por todos los críticos como su obra cumbre’ (60). The editor finds that in spite of the seriousness of the central theme, the transitory nature of worldly goods, Gómez Manrique is able to ‘entreverar metáforas y comparaciones que aligeran la carga conceptual’ (62). Two other compositions are considered political poems: the *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación* and the *Regimiento de príncipes*, although the latter contains a large body of didactic material. Vidal González considers the former ‘la obra más famosa y enigmática’ (62) of the poet’s work, combining both political and satirical elements as the poet inveighs against the deterioration of Castilian government under the poor leadership of Enrique IV.

Gómez Manrique’s output includes two *momos*, a genre that had existed since the early fifteenth century, and his nativity play, the *Representación del nacimiento de Nuestro Señor*, all of which were written in response to requests. He also produced a short religious work of three scenes named *Lamentaciones* by the critics. Although

classed as dramatic works, Vidal González remarks, ‘todavía estas obras no han adoptado las formas textuales propias del teatro’ (68).

Apart from Scholberg’s monograph and Vidal González’s *Introducción* there are a number of articles on individual poems by Gómez Manrique, notably on the elegy for Garcilaso de la Vega. The political context and implications of the *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación* is the subject of a recent essay by Nicholas Round and also of two articles by Carl Atlee on other poems, while the *Representación del nascimiento de Nuestro Señor* has been discussed by Harry Sieber and Stanislav Zimic. I shall refer to these publications as I write about the poems in turn.

Building on all this work, in this study I try to map, as far as possible, the development of Gómez Manrique’s writing throughout his productive life. Initially I attempted to isolate subject areas within his work, such as moral, political and didactic poems, and poems in which certain issues are raised in the tradition of debate poetry, together with some reflections upon his attitude towards women. This is the procedure followed by Kenneth Scholberg who separates the poems into six categories in his monograph of 1984 and building on this, Francisco Vidal González divides the poems into ten different categories in his edition. I soon found, however, that it was unhelpful to classify Gómez Manrique’s work into discrete categories of genre or theme in this way because it distorts the way we read the poems which deserve to be understood for what they actually do as poems.

The difficulties entailed by imposing generic rubrics is reflected in the way that Scholberg places the *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación*, the *Regimiento de príncipes* and the *Coplas para Arias Dávila* in a section on ‘las obras didactico-políticas’ (Scholberg 1984: 30-37), whereas Vidal González includes the first two of the afore-mentioned poems in a section of political poetry and the third in another of moral poems. The *coplas* addressed to Arias Dávila are indeed strongly moral in tone, but Gómez Manrique’s motivation for writing this poem was, as Carl Atlee (2007) argues, almost certainly political in part due to the resentment that he felt towards a man perceived by many to be corrupt and to have become a favourite of Enrique IV. The problem of classification arises again with the debate poems which are all very different in tone and content. Those addressed to Juan de Valladolid, for instance, are mocking and confrontational, whereas the exchange of ideas on the subject of nobility among Gómez Manrique, Francisco de Noya, Rodrigo Cota and Guillén de Segovia is a more dispassionate attempt to discuss an issue of wide interest and concern to contemporaries.

Paz y Melia for his part made no attempt to classify Gómez Manrique's poetry into discrete categories. In his edition of the poet's work he states, 'Bien hubiera querido ordenar las [composiciones] de este cancionero por sus respectivos géneros, por lo menos, a la manera que se hallan en el cancionero general de Hernando del Castillo [....]. He preferido, sin embargo, respetar el desorden en que el autor las dispuso para ofrecerlas al Conde de Benavente' (Gómez Manrique 1885-1886, I, xxxv-vi). By this he is referring to the manuscript, now kept in the library of the Palacio Real in Madrid (MP3), which was compiled for Rodrigo Pimentel, conde de Benavente and which Paz y Melia used as the basis of his text. It should be noted, however, that Paz y Melia, while following the order in which the poems are arranged in this manuscript, also intercalates other poems by Gómez Manrique which are found in different sources and not in the collection presented to Pimentel. Whether or not it is fair to speak of the 'desorden' in which the poet presented his work is debatable, but it is perhaps not insignificant that the *consolatoria* written for the poet's wife, Juana de Mendoza, composed in the poet's old age and after Pimentel's request had been granted, is inserted after a number of courtly love poems which almost certainly date from a much earlier period of his life.

With these problems in mind I have decided to consider his work in a broadly chronological framework, as far as this is possible, an approach which allows us to trace the development of Gómez Manrique's use of verse throughout his career. In so doing the necessity of labelling his poems as 'political' or 'moral' disappears and it is possible to have a more comprehensive overview of his work that can be seen in relation to the shifting political situation in which he lived and which reflected many of the issues that preoccupied him. Many of these issues are related to the fact that he was deeply involved in the Castilian political scene, but he also wrote a considerable amount of verse to members of his family and in what is believed to be his final poem, the *consolatoria* to his wife, we glimpse something of his true feelings concerning the tragedy that has befallen them.

The first chapter is devoted to his courtly love poetry as it is likely that much of this was written when he was a young man and Juan II was on the throne of Castile. This phase of his writing reflected his desire to conform to the image of the courtier who was able to combine the dual roles of a knight on the battlefield with that of a composer of lyric poetry. He makes it clear in the letter to the conde de Benavente accompanying his collection of poems that in no way does he concur with those who think that literary and military activities are mutually exclusive. He also expresses

similar sentiments in a letter to Pero González de Mendoza which accompanies his elegy for the marqués de Santillana. In fact he deems it essential for anyone who is to wield authority to be well read so that he can make informed decisions in accordance with the Stoic principles of prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude (Gómez Manrique 2003: 99), principles which he mentions in several of his poems written in his maturity.

In the second chapter I consider two elegies for knights both of which can be dated to the late 1450s. The *Defunción del noble cauallero Garci Laso de la Vega* is an elegy for Garcilaso, whose family was related to the Manriques, and who died during a skirmish against the Moors in 1458 in which Gómez Manrique, his brother Rodrigo and Enrique IV participated.² Enrique was ever reluctant to engage in large scale campaigns against the Moors and attracted criticism on account of his liking for many aspects of Moorish culture and customs. Gómez Manrique portrays the Moors as revelling in and laughing at the young man's death, although he does not go as far as Palencia, who reports that the king took pleasure in witnessing Garcilaso's final agony (Palencia 1999: 184). The poem contains a hint of its author's disapproval of Enrique IV's decision not to pass on the *encomienda* that Garcilaso had enjoyed to his young son. The *Planto* for the marqués de Santillana, who also died in 1458, was probably written two years later, but is a much longer work in the form of an allegory.

Juan de Mena died in 1456 leaving his *Coplas de los siete pecados* unfinished, having only written on four of the seven deadly sins. Gómez Manrique was one of three poets who took it upon themselves to finish this work, the others being Pero Guillén de Segovia and Jerónimo de Olivares, probably in the late 1450s or the following decade. Their approaches to this task are very different, but that of Olivares is in many ways the most interesting as he also provides glosses on Mena's work in the shape of forty-two *octavas*. A comparison of the three continuations and a study of Olivares's glosses is the subject of chapter three. Since there is no modern edition of Olivares's work, I have included the text of Mena's poem, together with Olivares's glosses and continuation, in an appendix to the thesis. The text is based on the Cromberger edition of Mena's work, published in Seville in 1505. Textual variations found in the 1548 Toledo and 1552 Anvers editions are given in footnotes.

My fourth chapter is formed of three parts and considers the verses that Gómez Manrique exchanged with other poets or prominent members of society. These cannot

² There is some debate as to the date of this skirmish; Gómez Manrique actually refers to it as occurring in 1455 in the first stanza although the chroniclers give 1458 as the date.

be dated with great accuracy, but it is likely that the *Coplas para Arias Dávila* were written some time between 1458 and 1465. Around 1458 Gómez Manrique became the leader of archbishop Carrillo's private army and a member of his household in Toledo. It was during this period of his life that Gómez Manrique probably came into closer contact with men not all of whom were born into such aristocratic families as his and who have been dubbed the 'Carrillo circle' by critics such as Moreno Hernández (1985). He exchanged verses with Juan Álvarez Gato, Juan de Valladolid, Pero Guillén de Segovia, Rodrigo Cota, Juan de Mazuela and Francisco de Noya, all of whom were members of this circle, thought to be formed soon after the death of the marqués de Santillana in 1458 (Moreno Hernández 1895: 18). All except Noya were *conversos*. Their verse dialogues were not like the *preguntas y respuestas* of earlier decades when poets or troubadours often sought to score points off each other, but instead are mostly thoughtful and reflective, collaborative exchanges on subjects such as the difficulty of composing verse and the issue of what constituted true nobility. On the other hand, his exchanges with Juan de Valladolid are of a very different nature and he heaps scorn and ridicule on him, accusing him of poor poetic style, mocking his humble origins and singling him out among his *converso* correspondents for his Jewish blood. The Carrillo circle probably lasted until 1470 as after that date relations between Carrillo and Isabel and Fernando became strained and Gómez Manrique supported the infantes rather than the archbishop. Exchanges with other poets are more difficult to date, such as that with Pedro de Mendoza.

The focus of chapter V is on the poems that reflect the political turmoil of the central decades of the fifteenth century. When Enrique IV succeeded Juan II in 1454 Gómez Manrique and his brother Rodrigo initially supported Enrique. Dissatisfaction on the part of many noble families soon set in, however, on account of Enrique's perceived Islamophilia, his moral and religious failings, and his promotion of men they deemed unsuitable to hold public office, as well as financial problems experienced in the kingdom. *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación*, which is most likely to have been written early in 1465 (Round 2013: 153), expresses anger and frustration at the poor government of Castile. Its tone is very different from the rest of Gómez Manrique's output and elicited several responses, notably from Pero Díaz de Toledo. The poem that bears the rubric *De Gómez Manrique quando se trataua la paz entre los señores reyes de Castilla e de Aragón e se desabinieron* (Gómez Manrique 2003: 619-621) is difficult to date since it contains no references to any specific incidents. Nevertheless, since there was often friction between Castile and Aragon, it reveals to us

the poet's desire for peace and unity between the two kingdoms and his belief that both would be stronger if they were united in the face of their enemies. This is significant because the Manrique family did not always remain loyal to the Castilian crown and at times during the earlier years of his career Gómez Manrique was closely allied with the infantes de Aragón. The final phase of Gómez Manrique's career was as *corregidor* of Toledo, a post to which he was appointed in 1477. Prior to that he composed his *Regimiento de príncipes*, at some point between 1469, when Isabel and Fernando were married, and 1474 when Isabel succeeded to the Castilian throne. In this poem, which is accompanied by a letter, he sets out his advice on good government to the couple and it is worthy of mention that only fourteen of the seventy-nine stanzas of this poem are addressed to Isabel, no doubt because Gómez Manrique could not have known how important a role Isabel was to play.

In my sixth and final chapter I discuss the only poem that we can say with any certainty Gómez Manrique wrote during the reign of the Catholic monarchs, the *consolatoria* that he started to compose for his wife, Juana de Mendoza, in 1481 after two of their children had died the previous year. This was not his first consolatory piece, since some twenty-five years before he had written one for his sister. Deviating from my intention of a chronological framework, I consider them together as they both concern family matters. The nativity play, *La Representación del nacimiento de Nuestro Señor*, was composed for one of Gómez Manrique's sisters, a nun at the convent of Calabazanos, and this chapter also includes discussion of works on a religious theme as well as some composed for family members and special occasions.

There are, of course, inevitable problems in treating Gómez Manrique's work within this kind of loose chronological framework. For instance, while the courtly love poetry studied in chapter I is almost certainly the product of Gómez Manrique's youth, it is also in the context of this poetry that we need to consider his response to Pere Torroella's *Maldezir de las mugeres*, a poem which in all likelihood was written some years after the main body of his love poetry. My long first chapter therefore spans not only Gómez Manrique's early work, but also his defence of the idea of courtliness in poetry and, most importantly, a rebuttal of Torroella's negative view of the female sex. Another problem is the dating of his debate poems: while some of these clearly belong to his years in the household of Alfonso Carrillo, which began in the late 1450s and lasted until roughly 1470, other verse exchanges with people outside the circle are difficult to date. Nevertheless, the advantages of this kind of broad chronological approach outweigh, I think, the drawbacks when we wish to consider all Gómez

Manrique's extant work of as a coherent whole, produced over a long life spent in a shifting political, social and personal context.

For this study I have used Vidal González's 2003 edition which follows the text, but not the disposition, of the manuscript prepared for the Conde de Benavente (MP3) some time after 1476 and which contains nearly all the poet's major works. An important exception is the *consolatoria* for Juana de Mendoza, composed after 1480, for which Vidal González gives the text of MN24, as he does for several other dialogues. I also refer to two prose works not found in either manuscript: the *Carta de buena nota*, attributed to Gómez Manrique and edited by Pedro Cátedra (2001), and the correspondence between the *protonotario* Juan de Lucena and Gómez Manrique, edited by Manuel Carrión (1978).

Chapter I Learning the Craft:

Courtly Love Poetry and Related Writings (c.1430-c.1455)

Introduction

Gómez Manrique's writings include a large number of texts of different kinds that are centred on the composition of love poetry, no doubt because, as a fifteenth century aristocrat, he was influenced by the prevailing atmosphere at court, where the production of poetry flourished, and the ability to compose verses was a hallmark of the ideal courtier. Like many others at Juan II's court, he was convinced that literary pursuits were in no way incompatible with the career of a knight who would be expected to engage in warfare, an opinion he expresses in letters to both the conde de Benavente and Pero González de Mendoza (Gómez Manrique 2003: 100; 363). Having been born around 1412, he might well have been acquainted, if not with the actual words, at least with the sentiments expressed by Juan Alfonso de Baena in the prologue to his *Cancionero* which appeared around 1430 when Gómez Manrique was still a young man. Baena writes about the various diversions in which princes and noblemen engage, such as games of dice and chess, as well as the very physical activities of jousting and hunting which bring pleasure but also test a man's courage and prepare his body for 'los grandes menesteres de las guerras e conquistas e batallas e lides e peleas' (Baena 1996: 13). He asserts, however, that for kings and noblemen the greatest pleasure is not to be derived from these very physical pursuits but from 'leyendo e oyendo e entendiendo los libros e otras escripturas de los notables e grandes fechos passados' (13-14). Poetry is singled out as the highest form of literary art to which only a few can aspire, since a poet needs to be well read in several languages as well as 'noble fydalgo e cortes e mesurado e gentil e gracioso e polido e donoso' (14). These qualities, in Baena's opinion, are enhanced in the nobleman when he presents himself as a lover, although it is sufficient to feign love for a woman for the purpose of writing: 'e que siempre se preçie e se finja de ser enamorado; porque es opynion de muchos sabyos, que todo omme que sea enamorado, conuiene a saber, que ame a quien deue e como deue e donde deue, afirman e disen qu'el tal de todas buenas dotrinas es doctado' (15).

The suggestion by Baena that it was sufficient to create the literary fiction of being in love suggests that poetic activity involved a certain amount of role-playing which was a rite of passage into adult courtly society. Gómez Manrique was a relative and a great admirer of the marqués de Santillana who expressed similar opinions on the

subject of poetic composition in his famous *Carta e Prohemio* to Don Pedro, condestable de Portugal. Having been asked by Don Pedro to send him a collection of his poetry, Santillana is rather dismissive of most of his own output, saying that writing poetry was something he did in his youth and that it was on a par ‘con el vestir, con el justar, con el dançar, e con otros tales cortesanos ejerçiçios’ (Santillana 2003: 642). He concurs with Baena, however, in believing that poetic talent is only to be found in ‘los animos gentiles, claros ingenios e elevados spiritus’ (84). Such ‘exercises’, when poetry was often recited in a public place, enabled the young nobleman to make an impression of himself on his audience and thereby gain prestige amongst his peers.

As Roger Boase comments, ‘The centre of patronage and justice was the royal court. [...] Here the composition of love poetry was a sign of good breeding, a means of contending for favours and one of the most popular forms of entertainment’ (Boase 1978: 152-153). The poet Fernando de Ludueña is aware of this when he writes about love in his *Doctrinal*. To play the role of a lover is a game or ‘deporte’ and should be the ambition of all aspiring courtiers: ‘porque tan dulce cognorte / y tan penado deporte / que Vençe Todo sauer / justamente deue ser / de la gentileza norte’ (ID 1895, Dutton 1990: II, 400, ll. 690-693). There was much vying for favours at court and to succeed it was necessary to cultivate an image of gentility, something that no doubt would have been encouraged by Juan II who appreciated poetry and was on the throne when Gómez Manrique was a young man. Some insight into the literary activities at court can be found in Fernán Pérez de Guzmán’s portrayal of Juan II in his *Generaciones y semblanzas*. Although he had a very low opinion of the king where his political virtues and ability to govern were concerned, he speaks in generous terms of his cultural attributes. The king, he says, enjoyed listening to the speech of other men who were ‘avisados e graciosos’ (Pérez de Guzmán 1965: 39), taking notice of what they said, and he had received a classical education that enabled him to speak and understand Latin. Regarding poetry, Pérez de Guzmán tells us that the king ‘oía muy de grado los dizires rimados e conoçía los viçios dellos, avía gran plazer en oír palabras alegres e bien apuntadas, e aun él mesmo las sabía bien dizir’ (39). This quotation makes us aware of two important facts, one being that at this time poetry at court was often recited aloud rather than being circulated in written form. Secondly, Juan II and probably many around him were so well trained in the rules of rhetoric of the *gaya ciencia* that they were able to spot the ‘viçios’ or defects in a poem’s composition.

We cannot be sure exactly when Gómez Manrique composed his love poetry, but it might be safe to assume that most of this part of his output of some thirty poems³ was produced when he was a young man and mindful that his model, the marqués de Santillana, when referring to his own poetry said, ‘Ca estas tales cosas alegres e jocosas andan e concurren con el tiempo de la nueva edad de la juventud’ (83).⁴ Also, when he was composing his love poetry, Gómez Manrique may well have been influenced by the above-mentioned Ludueña with whom he exchanged verses and who later became *maestresala* to Isabel la Católica. Victoria Burrus draws attention to Ludueña’s long poem of over thirteen hundred lines entitled *Doctrinal de la gentileza* in which he gives advice on various aspects of how a courtier should conduct himself (Burrus 1998: 117-118, 122-123). On the subject of love he states that the role of the courtly lover is very much the province of the younger man when he writes, ‘El Galan a de tener / lo primero tal hedad / que de treinta y seis no pase’ (ID 1895, Dutton 1990: II, ll. 35-37). Indeed he makes fun of the idea of an elderly lover when he says, ‘pues aquestas y otras tales / Gentilezas espeçiales / Que los amores guarnezen / ni a los Viejos pertenesçen / ni las consienten sus males’ (ll. 724-727). While there is no reason why some of the *cançiones* should not have been written at later periods of his life, it seems safe to assume that most of them are from early on in his production.

The Importance of Love Poetry and Rhetorical Training

That Juan II was able to pass judgement on a poem in the way mentioned above reflects the fact that an essential part of an aristocrat’s education in the Middle Ages consisted of a grounding not only in Latin but also in the arts of rhetoric and poetics. Medieval compilers of textbooks on rhetoric which guided students through these rules were highly influenced by classical writers such as Cicero. In the treatise on public speaking, *Ad Herennium*, attributed to Cicero in the past, the anonymous author writes about *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria* and *pronuntiatio*, or invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery and these topics remained the basis of the teaching of rhetoric in the Middle Ages. Although Cicero was almost certainly writing with political speech-making in mind, what he had to say was still relevant to fifteenth-century writers of poetry since their compositions were frequently received orally at court and they were motivated to impress their audiences. On the reasonable

³ Although they are included in the section entitled *Poesía amorosa* in Francisco Vidal González’s edition, poems IV and XXII do not appear to belong to this category and I have not commented upon them in this chapter.

⁴ Admittedly Gómez Manrique refers to himself as no longer a young man in ‘Señoras que mucho amo’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 122).

assumption, then, that it was in the court that Gómez Manrique cut his poetic teeth, we can approach the thirty-five courtly love poems specifically for what they tell us about what he learned as a composer of verses. In the next few pages I will endeavour to draw out what it is that he was expected to learn and master since such matters would have been of major concern to him; the topic of the poems as such would have been of very minor importance in comparison.

How did people such as Juan II develop an understanding of what was good poetry? In his book on literary theory in fifteenth-century Castile Julian Weiss considers the much-debated question of whether a poet was born or made, referring to exchanges between Villasandino and certain contemporaries, concluding that ‘the consensus was that poetry was a gift from God, implanted in the poet at birth. Talent alone, however, was not enough; it was necessary to refine one’s skills through constant practice and imitation of great writers’ (Weiss 1990: 27). Weiss explains that poetic composition was not taught as a separate subject, but the poet Enrique de Villena in his *Arte de trovar*, written some time between 1427 and 1433 (56)⁵, shows concern that many people, in attempting to compose verse, only saw fit to heed the rules of metrics due to ‘mengua de la sçiençia’ with the consequence that ‘no es fecha diferençia entre los claros ingenios, e los oscuros’ (Villena 1993: 43-44). In fact he reproaches the marqués de Santillana on this score: ‘no podéis transfundir en los oydores de vuestras obras, las esçelentes inuençiones que natura ministra a la serenidad de vuestro ingenio, con aquella propiedat que fueron conçebidas’ (45).

These views of Villena, who originally wrote his *Doce trabajos de Hércules* in Catalan, may well have their source in the writing of the Catalan, Lluís d’Averçó, who around the turn of the fifteenth century produced a manual of rules, the *Torcimany*, to be followed by aspiring poets. *Torcimany*’s prologue opens with the opinion that ‘la sciencia de trobar entre los homens no sabens ne enteses en gramatiqua es posada sotz compreniment escur o no be intelhigible’ (Averçó 1952: I, 15). Much of the material in the *Torcimany* on the subject of the pitfalls to be avoided when writing poetry appears in the earlier Occitan manual the *Flors del Gay Saber* attributed to Guilhem Molinier. Molinier was closely connected to the Consistori del Gai Saber, established in Toulouse in 1323 as an academy for the revival and promotion of poetry in the tradition of the troubadour lyric. Averçó and Jaume March, with the support of Joan I of Aragon, founded a similar establishment in Barcelona in 1393, the Consistori de la Gaya

⁵ Weiss quotes Elvira de Aguirre, *Die ‘Arte de trovar’ von Enrique de Villena* (Cologne, 1968) regarding the date of composition of this work.

Ciençia, and it is significant that Juan II of Castile's first wife was María, princess of Aragon, suggesting that there was a considerable Aragonese cultural influence in the Castilian court and Santillana's even more important contribution. Although *Torcimany* and the *Flors* refer to a different metric system and to other types of stanza, not found in Castilian poetry, *Torcimany* is the only known and detailed manual in an Iberian language written specifically for poets and was almost certainly known to Santillana and those who frequented the royal court.

The poetic 'vícios' to which Pérez de Guzmán refers are presumably of the kind discussed at length in a section of the *Flors del Gay Saber* where the writer identifies three main categories of faults, 'barbarismes', 'soloecismes' and 'allebolus'. 'Barbarismes' involved individual words which were mis-spelt and 'soloecismes' were mistakes related to a group of words, implying the use of the wrong part of speech or an incorrect inflection. 'Allebolus', however, a term that has not survived in modern usage, related to the use of a word in the wrong context. There follows a complicated personification of the genealogy of these faults or 'viciis', as the author calls them. Barbarisme, Soloecisme and Allebolus are personified as three kings who wage war against three queens, Dictio, Oraison and Sentenza. Barbarisme and Soloecisme had ten arrows in common, representing different 'viciis' with which they attacked the two queens Dictio and Oraison. One of these arrows, Cacosynthesis, includes a number of faults involving poor word order that can change the sense of a line and the placing of successive words that have several consonants in the same syllable. Harsh sounding and ugly juxtaposition of words producing 'laia et aspra sonoritat' (Gatien-Arnoult 1841-1843: 30) are also criticised. Madona Rhetorica, who is deemed to be the power that oversees all the rules, is introduced and she arranges marriages between the three kings and the sisters of the three queens. These marriages produce a great number of offspring who all bear names of different figures of speech. The strife between different members of the extended family continues until Madona Rhetorica intervenes and achieves harmony by the giving them flowers from her garden, the 'flors' of the work's title.

The poetic defects themselves are subdivided into two main types: content and style and metrics. In a section of *Torcimany* the first group, 'en sentensa' (Averçó 1956: 1, 113-132), is broken down into seventeen *viciis*. The majority of these are general faults that should always be avoided, such as self-contradiction, ambiguity, verbosity and excessive praise of people. Others include *Sobrelaus*, or exaggerated praise, irrelevant digressions and *separatio*, or the quoting of an authority or text that is not to the point. A change in the register of language used, from solemn and grandiose to

humble or vice versa is also sanctioned. Two *vicis*, however, seem to stand out in this section on the content of a poem. One of these concerns the *mal dig especial* when a satirical work mentions a person by name. Satire is not considered wrong as a genre, but its aim should be to chastise vice in general and not to offend anyone in particular, so that any person who recognizes himself in what he hears or reads may feel guilty without being publicly shamed. The other *vici* that is worthy of note is that of *dezonestat* which in this context means the opposite of respectable and decent, as the writer of this manual explains: ‘Dezonestat es cant hom ditz en sos dictatz paraulas dezonestas lagezas e viltatz majormen en canso la quals deu esser de bels motz honestz e ben pauzatz’ (122). This is particularly relevant to love poetry which must not include any improper requests made by the man to his lady, as the writer states, ‘qua no es cauza honesta derechuriera aprofichabla ni necessaria que yeu demande que mi dona de cuy canti me done un baysar’ (122). Also on the subject of love poetry it is interesting to note that there is a comment to the effect that the reason for writing it is so that the woman addressed might be more disposed to marry the man who serenaded her. This is not a tradition that was carried into fifteenth-century Castile where the notion of courtly love never appears to have any necessary connection to marriage.

The section on the *vicis* that are ‘fora sentensa’, referring to all matters of style and metrics, includes fourteen faults to be avoided concerning choice of vocabulary and word order. The repetition of a word more often than is necessary and words inappropriate for the context, known as ‘pedaç’ (1, 165-168), are frowned upon, as is the use of the same rhyme. The *vicis* of rhyme and syllable count are obviously different in Catalan, but the principle remains the same in Castilian.

I mention these rules of rhetoric in order to emphasize the parameters within which poets such as Gómez Manrique had to work and the constraints that they must have felt when attempting to express themselves in verse, always conscious of the *viçios* that their audience could well be quick to spot. Obviously, for this study, the ways in which Gómez Manrique strove to avoid such faults while developing the basic rhetorical elements of *inventio*, *dispositio* and *elocutio* are particularly relevant. *Inventio* was about finding the most suitable language to express what the poet wished to say; *dispositio* was how he arranged this material; the *elocutio* was the style he used to complete his work. Since his love poetry, like that of his contemporaries, dwelled for the most part on similar themes such as the sadness of experiencing unrequited love, the pain of separation and parting from the beloved, and the fear of rejection, *inventio* was of paramount importance to show that he had found a different way of expressing these

sentiments in the competitive atmosphere of the court. *Dispositio* was more relevant in the longer poems and the use of a number of different figures of speech meant that *elocutio* could also contribute to his acquiring a more individual style of poetry, although many of the metaphors used by Gómez Manrique were commonly used by poets who were his contemporaries. In studying this part of Gómez Manrique's work I have chosen to separate the *canciones* from the *decires* since the latter are for the most part longer and can be classified according to their thematic content, unlike the *canciones*. Both *canciones* and *decires*, however, are primarily of interest because of the rhetorical devices used and because they almost certainly reflect the efforts of Gómez Manrique at an early stage of his poetic career when he was forging his skills as a poet and before he went on to use these same skills when treating other subjects of a less ephemeral nature than courtly love.

The *canciones*

Fifteen of Gómez Manrique's love poems merely bear the title *canCIÓN* and are of either twelve or twenty lines in length, always beginning with a quatrain followed by one or two stanzas of eight lines. These shorter poems, perhaps intended to be set to music, are necessarily limited as far as the development of *inventio* is concerned and this is particularly true of the twelve-line poems in which repetition in the form of an *estribillo* at the end of each stanza limits still further the poet's scope for developing the subject matter in an ingenious way. Therefore, while considering the *canciones*, I should like to focus primarily on the stylistic features of these poems.

There are many examples of the use of the *estribillo* where either the final line or lines of the first verse are repeated at the end of the second and third verses. Sometimes the wording of the refrain is changed slightly or only part of the line is repeated, but the intention is to remind the listener or reader of the thought that the poet wishes to convey. A simple example of this is the *canCIÓN* of twelve lines '¡O muy discreta donzella' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 121-122) in which the poet claims to have fallen in love, in spite of his resolve not to do so, and assures the woman to whom he is writing that she is the object of his affections. The first quatrain ends with the lines 'sabed que vos soys aquella / por cuyos amores muero' and the second of these lines is repeated at the end of the second stanza. The one striking feature of this poem is the use of the verb 'porfiar' at the beginning of the second stanza and its repetition three lines later, again at the end of the line, to reinforce the thought the poet wishes to impart. Another *canCIÓN*, 'Vos seréys, dama sentida' (131-132), supposedly addressed to a

woman of great beauty, is also very simply expressed. In telling her that she can choose whether or not to fall in love, the poet assures her that she will always be loved by many, and more so by him, repeating the line ‘de muchos e más de mí’ at the end of both verses.

Gómez Manrique also uses the more conventional broken rhythm of the *pie quebrado*, a line of four syllables, in two of the *canciones*. In ‘Dexadme mirar a quien’ (123-124) the *pie quebrado* occurs in the second and fourth lines of the first stanza when the poet declares that he wishes to gaze upon the object of his affections in spite of the fact that she does not reciprocate his feelings for her. These two short lines ‘me faze mal’ and ‘nin comunal’ stress the idea of his lack of hope which is echoed in the final four lines, ‘que morir a mi conuién, / si no me val / la que nin me faze bien / nin comunal’. A similar pattern is found in ‘De guisa vuestro deseo’ (129-130) where he expresses his discontent for every woman he sees except for the woman he loves. The initial quatrain, with the four-syllable second and fourth rhyming lines, ‘m’atormenta’ and ‘me contenta’, containing words of opposite meaning, stress the poem’s message and this is recapitulated in the final four lines with a repetition of ‘me contenta’ in the last line.

An example where the use of the *estribillo* is exploited more fully is found in the *canción* ‘El que arde en biua llama’ (120-121) which is not directed to any woman in particular, but expresses the poet’s conviction that when suffering from unrequited love it is impossible to feel for others in a similar predicament. He states this in the opening quatrain where he uses metaphors that are often found in the context of courtly love, one of which is to liken passion to a flame, as in the first line quoted above. In the second line, ‘sirviendo a quien le condena’ the lover is seen as the servant of the woman as he attempts to please her and gain her love, but the combination of his lack of success and continuing devotion to her results in him feeling as if he has been condemned. In the first half of the second stanza the poet admits that he finds himself in this situation, suffering ‘tan afortunadas penas’ (l. 6). Here the use of this oxymoron implies that such suffering is fortunate because it suggests that the poet is capable of noble feelings. The final four lines repeat the idea expressed in the first quatrain, although the language of lines ‘que qualquiera que bien ama / a quien su bien desordena’ (ll. 9-10) is less intense than that of the opening lines of the poem.

A number of rhetorical devices are to be found in these *canciones*, their function being to add subtlety and acuity, or ‘agudeza’ to the sentiments expressed. In his book on the rhetoric of *cancionero* love poetry, Juan Casas Rigall considers that ‘la agudeza

constituye un vehículo para desvelar realidades inefables, como la hermosura de la dama en la tradición cancioneril' (Casas Rigall 1995: 14). One rhetorical figure often used by Gómez Manrique to heighten the effect of his writing is antithesis, defined by Averçó as 'una figura la qual se fa per diversssitat de clauzulas posadas contrariament las unas ab las altrás, ço es, unas contra altrás'. He explains the function of this figure: 'E fa's aquesta manera de figura per tolre, per vençre, per abaxar e per confondre la una per diversssitat de la altra, la qual diversssitat contrariés la una ab la altra (Averçó 1956: I, 300). An example of this is to be found in the twelve-line, 'Esperanza de venir' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 125), and is appropriate here since the poem expresses the idea that the joy of being reunited with the beloved outweighs the pain of departing from her later. The first four lines, 'Esperança de venir / alegre, si Dios quisiere, / causa que no desespere / con el dolor del partir' contain three examples of simple antithesis, 'esperanza' being contrasted with the verb 'desesperar', alegre' with 'dolor' and 'venir' with 'partir'. In the second stanza the same technique is used, with 'la gozosa venida' contrasted with 'el pesar de la partida' (ll. 6&8) and the last two lines of the first verse are repeated at the end of the second as an *estribillo*. Another use of antithesis occurs in the first two lines of the *canción* 'Amor me manda dezir / temor me faze callar' (126), where the poet expresses his fear of being rejected by the lady. The inner conflict he claims to experience is emphasized by the placing of the verbs 'dezir' and 'callar' at the end of two consecutive lines in the introductory quatrain and this idea is reinforced in the second stanza by the mention of 'la dicha diuisión' and his 'contrarios pensamientos' (ll. 2&3). The rhyme of 'callar' with 'penar' in the first verse stresses that his silence and inability to declare his love exacerbate his suffering. Antithesis is also a device used in 'Vuestros ojos me prendieron' (128) when the poet writes of his suffering, using the common juxtaposition of life and death: 'que se trasformó mi vida / en vna muerte penosa' (ll. 7-8). The intention of this poem is to focus on the poet's eyes and the woman's, and the effect of her eyes on the poet's when he first caught sight of her. Lamenting the fact that they have both lost out, since his eyes are blinded by tears and hers have lost a loyal admirer, he places 'perdieron' and 'ganaron' at the end of consecutive lines to emphasize his point.

The second stanza of the above-mentioned *canción* also contains anaphora, defined by Averçó as 'començament de molts bordons posatz sens migá, per una matexa dicció; och e es començament de moltas clauzulas posadas sens migá, per una matexa dicció; och e axí es començament de moltas coblas posadas arreu, per una matexa dicció' (Aversó 1956: 279): 'Viéronvos tanto fermosa, / viéronvos tanto polida', with

the intention of expressing the intensity of his feelings. This type of repetition, with the same effect, is found in the *canción* the first three lines of which read, ‘Con la beldad me prendistes, / con la graçia me robastes, / con la bondad me robastes (Gómez Manrique 2003: 127). Anaphora and antithesis are combined in ‘Yo parto con gran querella’ (124-125) when the poet reflects that if he did not love the lady he is addressing his situation would be very different: ‘nin vuestro mal me penara / nin vuestro bien me pluguiera (ll. 7-8)’.

Anaphora occurs again in ‘Sabe Dios cuánto porfio’ (129), the verb ‘tornar’ used in two consecutive lines, but this poem is interesting because it contains a metaphor. Here Gómez Manrique likens himself to a river that cannot change course: ‘pero soy tornado río, / que no me puedo tornar’ (ll. 9-10) to describe how he cannot help loving the woman who has rejected him. This is a common metaphor whose *locus classicus* is to be found in the famous *coplas* of his nephew, Jorge Manrique. Generally the *canciones* do not contain a great number of metaphors and those used by Gómez Manrique in these poems are of a variety often found in contemporary love poetry. In this poem the poet speaks of the effect the woman has had on him by merely looking at him, using the verb ‘prender’ to intimate the feelings she has inspired. The strength of the feelings he claims to have is underlined with the use of ‘robar’ to denote the stealing of his heart in the second line and ‘ferir’ referring to the pain caused by his attachment in the third. His feelings for the lady have become such that he has become her prisoner, declaring at the beginning of the second stanza, ‘De la prisión no recelo’ (l. 5). This line demonstrates a certain linguistic symmetry here as the word ‘prisión’, with its shared etymology, looks back to ‘prendistes’ in the first line. Similarly, in the second and third lines of the second stanza the words ‘grado’ and ‘robo’ look back to and extend the significance of the line ‘con la graçia me robastes’ (l. 2) and likewise, the ‘golpe’ (l. 9) alludes to the verb ‘feristes’ in the third line of the first verse. The verb ‘prender’ is used in a similar context in the *canción*, ‘Con la belleza prendés’ (127) but this is an example of a poem where the relationship between man and woman is seen in terms of a battle with the latter achieving a conquest, a much-used trope in medieval poetry. The use of the verb ‘prender’ in the introductory quatrain tells us that the woman captivates all the men she looks at and this verb is also associated with the idea of taking prisoner, something that follows a defeat in battle, again a common trope. The pain of love is expressed by the image of the man being wounded by the ‘fonda’ or catapult of the lady. The metaphor is developed in the second stanza where the battle is seen as involving the siege of a city with the lady in question aiming at those besieging her

from the city's walls and able to captivate all her opponents with her 'fonda de fermosura' (l. 8). The figure is further extended by the allusion to the 'arnés' of armour worn by the men which affords them no protection against their attacker (ll. 9-10).

Antanaclasis, defined by Casas Rigall as the use of a word with more than one meaning, occurs in the *canción* 'Señoras que mucho amo' (122) with its use of the word 'amo', giving this poem a playful and humorous tone. In the first line the poet admits to a love of women, using the verb 'amar' and then appeals to the ladies of the court to find him 'algún amo' (l. 4), as he is unattached or 'esento' (l. 2). It soon becomes clear in the second verse, despite the masculine ending of the word 'amo', that he is seeking a woman to love as he swears to remain true to one who will love him. The masculine form 'amo' has a long tradition behind it going back to the troubadour *midons*, but here it also effectively maintains the rhyme scheme while its occurrence as the last word of each stanza insists on the idea of the subservience required of the noble lover who seeks to court a woman. In the third stanza he admits to the foolishness of this desire to engage in 'tal moçedad' (l. 14), typical of a younger man, and speaks of the loss of freedom that will ensue when he speaks of 'queriendo mi libertad / poner en fuerte cadena' (ll. 15-16) and fights against this: 'sintiendo lo qual reclamo' (17).

An example of anadiplosis, defined by Averçó as 'una figura la qual de sa propia natura requer e vol que la derrera dicció del bordó primer de la cobla haja paritat e companyia ab la primera dicció del bordó subseguent sens migá al primer bordó de aquella matexa cobla' (Averçó 1956: 278), occurs in 'Si los fines ni miré' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 123). In this piece the poet is admitting that he has brought his sorrows upon himself: 'pues los yo, triste, los busqué' (l. 4). By repeating 'Busqué' at the start of the following line he emphasizes the fact that he is blaming himself.

Although virtually all Gómez Manrique's love poetry treats the well-worn themes of unrequited love and the pain of rejection or separation from the beloved, there is an exception to this in the *canción* 'Si no me vence pasión' (130-131) in which he sings the praises of the lady, not just on the grounds of her physical attractions but also on account of her virtuous character, so much so that in loving her he feels that there is no conflict between reason and his inclination: 'vuestros valores / son inmensos çiertamente; / tanto que dan ocasión, / fablando con vos verdad, / a no poder la razón / contrastar la voluntad' (ll. 15-20). The awareness of a conflict between 'razón' and 'voluntad' arises often in the writings of fifteenth century Castilians, but more often in works that are written with didactic intentions, such as Juan de Mena's *Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntat* which Gómez Manrique completed after Mena's death, rather

than in love poetry that was written for entertainment at court. In a footnote to his edition of Gómez Manrique's work Francisco Vidal González suggests that this poem is in fact addressed to the poet's wife, Juana Mendoza, since in the third and final stanza he says, 'No vos loo por amores, / que la ley no lo consiente' (ll. 13-14). This is an allusion to the conventions of the courtly code which dictated that love poems should not be addressed to a spouse. We know that Juana regretted that she received no poems from her husband as a young woman, because Gómez Manrique refers to this in the letter that he wrote to accompany the *consolatoria* that he composed for her many years later after the death of two of their adult children. In this letter he admits that one of the motives that spurred him into writing that poem was this memory: 'tu merced [...] en la moçedat me solía dezir, estando en nuestros plazerres, que por qué de quantas trobas que hazía no enderesçaua a ella alguna' (452). In this poem, therefore, Gómez Manrique is adhering to the rules and this poem is in stark contrast with the rest of his love poetry which concentrates on the conventional sufferings of love. Instead, by praising Fortune for endowing this lady with the attributes of a sympathetic and virtuous character, he conveys a sense of serenity and contentment.

Finally, in this section on the *canciones*, Francisco Vidal González includes in his edition a *Canción ajena* (174-176), considered to be anonymous (ID 1880, Dutton 1990: II, 238), which Gómez Manrique has reworked as a gloss. The original poem is a lament on the part of a man who, rather than writing of eternal devotion to the woman despite her indifference, composes a denunciation of her, hoping that she will always be 'desamada y mal querida' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 174, l. 8), an unusual sentiment in the context of Castilian courtly love poetry. Gómez Manrique expands this poem to twice its length by inserting two lines of his own before each couplet of the original and thereby adding a greater emphasis to the feelings expressed. To this end, for example, he introduces the first stanza by saying that his experience has led him to lose all hope and refers to the poem as a 'grida' (l. 14) or cry of despair, and as a prelude to the first use of the *estribillo*, 'de mí fueste bien querida, / yo desamado de ti', he declares, 'De la ora en que te vi, / la qual nunca se me olvida' (ll. 17-20). Similarly, when the original poet wishes that the woman might suffer as well, saying, 'Porque más sin dubda creas / la mi pena dolorida', Gómez Manrique introduces these lines with 'Véate yo perseguida / del dolor que me guerreas' (ll. 21-24). By using the verbs 'perseguir' and 'guerrear', associated with conflict, he emphasizes the intensity of feeling on the part of the rejected lover whose verses he glosses. Thus he softens the bluntness of the original

poem and renders it more in keeping with the ‘cortesía traditionally expected of this genre.’⁶

The *decires*

In my discussion of the *canciones* I have made no attempt to classify them other than by their use of rhetorical devices by which Gómez Manrique sought to underline the main effect he intended. Nor have I analysed any of them in detail, because their content is not very diverse and their brevity means that scope for developing *inventio* is limited and inventiveness of ideas was not the point. The *decires*, however, are for the most part considerably longer and, although they focus on the same themes of unrequited love, Gómez Manrique is able to present them with a much greater variety of *inventio* and I have, therefore, endeavoured to classify these poems into sub-groups according to the way the theme is approached. They include poems which appear in the manuscripts with various other rubrics, but for present purposes are here treated as *decires*.

Poems of Praise

Praise of the poet’s lady is the overriding theme found in the *decires* and the poem *Quexas e conparaçiones* (158-160) is worthy of a detailed analysis. Here Gómez Manrique takes a measured and thoughtful attitude towards the sufferings of the rejected lover with none of the hyperbole to found in some of his other love poetry and there is a certain irony in the way he chooses to express himself. Although he sets out to praise his lady, he does so by focussing on all the negative aspects of falling in love. He structures the poem so that the first line of each of the six stanzas refers to an aspect of the sorrow he experiences on failing to win the lady’s affections, working through the emotions commonly felt by lovers, speaking of ‘enojos’, ‘amarguras’, ‘ansyas’, ‘querellas’, ‘pasyones’ and ‘desdenes’. She is all the more praiseworthy, however, because her attributes, ‘gracia y fermosura’ (l. 4) and ‘donayre’ (l. 10), are such that his negative emotions fade when he finds himself in her presence. To describe how his mood becomes positive when he sees her, each stanza contains a clause introduced by the word ‘commo’, sometimes used hypothetically, as in the second half of the first verse: ‘avnque no quedo guarido / de mis penas, / commo sy fuesen ajenas / las olvido’ (ll. 5-8). The sixth stanza also contains a hypothesis when he declares, that on seeing the woman, it is ‘commo sy grandes bienes / reçibiese’ (ll. 43-44). In the other verses

⁶ Gómez Manrique also used the *cançión* form for two religious poems, ‘Entre todas escogida’ (281-282) and ‘Santa Virgen escogida’ (294).

‘commo’ introduces a short simile, such as in the third verse, where his ‘ansyas secretas’ are chased away on seeing her ‘bien commo las cueruas prietas / perseguidas del neblí’ (ll. 19-20), and in the fourth where his ‘justas querellas [...] fuyen commo las estrellas / ante los rayos febles’ (ll. 25, 27-28), both figures drawn from the natural world.

Gómez Manrique makes use of the *pie quebrado* in the sixth and eighth lines of each verse, the interruption of the rhythm drawing attention to certain key words which he is seeking to emphasize. A good example of this occurs in the second verse when he speaks of the way the bitterness he feels vanishes in her presence: ‘e quanto me days dolor / e cuydado, / en vos ver, es transformado / en amor’ (ll. 13-16). The rhyme scheme enhances the impact that the poem makes on the reader or listener; in the first quatrain of the initial stanza, for example, the ‘enojos’ experienced by the poet on account of the woman’s ‘desmesura’ are dispelled by the sight of her ‘ojos’ and her ‘fermosura’ and between ‘dolor’ and ‘amor’ are coupleded effectively. The wording of the *fyn* or *peroratio*, with its *pie quebrado*, draws on the traditional metaphor of love sickness: ‘No vos plega más dexarme / padeçer / pues sola tenéys poder / de sanarme’ (ll. 49-52); despite the effect that the woman’s presence has on him, he is not ‘guarido’ (l. 5). Similarly, in stanza V he tells her that however much he looks at her, ‘no sanáys’ (l. 40) while in the final lines of stanza VI he implores her, ‘pues queredme guareçer / o matarme’ (ll. 47-48). Herein lies the modest *inventio* in the subject-matter of this poem: the poet sees himself as a sick man who can only be cured by his lady reciprocating the feelings that he shows for her and the vocabulary is chosen to sustain this idea.

Praise of the woman is also the theme of *Loor a vna dama* (137-138), a poem of five stanzas of nine lines. Here there is no appeal to the woman to respond to the poet’s feelings, but he sets the lady apart from all others on account, not only of her physical beauty described in the first verse, but also because of her prudence and wisdom or ‘cordura’ (l. 18) in the second. The central idea, that beauty and prudence together are never to be found in other women, is expressed in the third verse through antithesis: ‘Estas dos contrariedades / que siempre son enemigas, / fermosura e bondades, / quiero, mi bien, que sepades / ser en vos grandes amigas’ (ll. 19-23). He uses antithesis again in the fourth verse where, rather than lamenting that his feelings are not reciprocated, he sees something positive: ‘Si d’esto mal me viniere, / dolo por bien empleado’ (ll. 28-29), taking comfort from the idea that he has fallen captive to such a paragon of beauty and prudence. The use of the *pie quebrado* in the seventh and ninth lines of each verse, integrated into the rhyme scheme of the final four lines, adds emphasis to the thought

expressed. For example, in the final four lines of the first verse, ‘en el mundo solo vna / sin contienda, / más perfeta sin enmienda / que ninguna’, the rhyming words ‘contienda’ and ‘enmienda’ strengthen the idea of the woman’s perfection, whilst ‘vna’ and ‘ninguna’ stress her uniqueness. The poem ends on a playful note when the poet, having exalted the lady he admires to such a degree, realizes that in so doing he may cause offence to other women, and asks them to forgive him: ‘perdónenme las casadas / e donzellas’ (ll. 44-45).

Another poem of praise, ‘El corazón se me fue’ (172), addressed in its rubric to ‘vna dueña que yua cubierta’, consists of just two *octavas*. Its inventiveness lies in the fact that the poet recognizes the woman’s qualities of ‘graçia y gentil ayre’ (l. 10) in spite of the fact that her identity is masked.

Two Requerimientos and the Imagery of the Cárcel de Amor

Although two poems carry the title of *Requerimiento* and treat the theme of the lover who is afraid to declare himself to the lady he loves, Gómez Manrique presents the subject very differently. The poem ‘La mi contraria fortuna’ (111-113) is of six eight-line stanzas with a *fyn* and is typical of much contemporary courtly love poetry in the sentiments it declares. Antithesis is used to convey inner conflict, for example, ‘o por mi poca esperança / breue desesperaré’ (ll. 23-24) and ‘Luego desamé mi vida / por amar vuestra figura’ (ll. 33-34). The stock metaphor of the lover losing his freedom and becoming the woman’s prisoner occurs in the fourth stanza: ‘en vos ver tanto hermosa, / mi libertad catiué’ (ll. 31-32).

The other poem, also entitled *Requerimiento*, ‘Largos tienpos he gastado’ (155-158) treats the subject-matter in more detail in eight stanzas of ten lines. In the first the poet explains that he has been suffering in silence for fear of offending the woman and he uses the effect of the rhyming *pie quebrado* of ‘padeciendo’ and ‘encubriendo’ in the second and fifth lines to stress this. The rhyme scheme of the final four lines of this stanza also emphasizes the poet’s sentiments: ‘que commo la byua flama / es de natura que quema, / bien así el que bien ama / es neçesario que tema’. In the second stanza the *pie quebrado* again stresses the conflict between the love of the poet and his fear of rejection with the rhyme of the second and fourth lines, ‘amador’ and ‘el temor’, and this is reinforced with the antithesis of ‘amiga’ and ‘enemiga’ in the antepenultimate and final lines of this stanza. The topos of the *cárcel de amor* is introduced in the third stanza when the poet makes a comparison between himself, as the lover on the point of declaring his passion, with the criminal who confesses to a crime after being subjected

to torture. The rhyme of ‘malhechor’ and ‘dolor’ (ll. 2&5) are appropriate in the context, as are ‘tarde’ and ‘cobarde’ (ll. 27&29) to denote the poet’s hesitance in declaring his love. In the fourth stanza the poet begs the woman to cast her eyes over ‘este blanco papel’ (l. 33), a line which suggests to us that this poem was probably not composed to be recited aloud, and he continues by telling her that her beauty has been responsible for ‘tornar en seruidora / mi voluntat libertada’ (ll. 39-40). This is another example of antithesis since the ‘voluntat’ that has been freed refers to his ability finally to address the woman, but this has made him her servant which implies the loss of his freedom. Another allusion to this situation is found at the end of the sixth stanza when the poet uses an oxymoron in two consecutive lines: ‘e voluntaria presyón / o cárcel de libertados’ (ll. 59-60). A similar figure of speech is used at the end of the seventh stanza when he describes himself as ‘esforçado tan judío / e de libre catyuado’ (ll. 69-70).

Gómez Manrique also uses the imagery of the *cárcel de amor* in a shorter poem of three nine-line stanzas, ‘¡O la más de las hermosas!’ (173). In this poem, however, he does not seek to use the same imagery throughout but to vary it, and only in the first stanza does he use carceral images to express the hold this woman has over him he utters a series of exclamations in four consecutive lines, each one referring to his loss of freedom: ‘¡O llaue de mis cadenas, / calnado de mis esposas, / cárcel de mi libertad, / verdugo de mis tormentos’ (ll. 4-7). In the second stanza he admits to his fear of a rival and compares himself and his unease to a ship at sea. In the third verse he realizes that the woman in question is beyond reproach and compares her to a precious jewel and he would be a fool not to worry about losing her.

A poem of twenty one stanzas, each of nine lines, bears the rubric *Batalla de amores* (145-152) and takes the form of an allegory where the poet and protagonist portrays himself as a warrior in a battle trying to defend himself from danger, that danger being the tyranny of love and the suffering that it can bring. In the opening stanza the poet becomes aware of an imminent threat as he hears the distant sound of trumpets and other instruments associated with war and admits to the fear that he feels. In the second verse he calls for his ‘armas defensiuas, / dexando las ofensiuas, / sólo por salvar mi fe’ (ll. 15-17), having made a conscious effort to avoid suffering the pain of unrequited love. This military allegory is developed in the third verse with the arrival on the scene of ‘pensamiento’, the personification of his thoughts, who urges him not to break with the promise he has made and which he has kept so far. As the enemy advances the poet determines to fight, and if necessary, to die for his freedom. The analogy with war is extended as the eighth verse bears the rubric ‘La ordenança de la

batalla' and is described in detailed military terms: his loyalty to the pledge that he has made is in the 'batalla primera' (l. 65) and it is 'flanked' on his right by his 'constante verdad' (l. 67), which motivates him to keep the pledge he has made to himself, and on the left by his secret fear of defeat. As he musters his strength to combat his enemy, he refers to 'vn tropel bien defensible' (l. 78) in the ninth stanza which boosts his confidence. The battle commences with the appearance of Breçayda, whose name recalls that of a widow of the Trojan war and a favourite of Achilles, and who brings with her five banners and 'un buen tropel' (l. 109) of beautiful women. The poet fights bravely, saying, 'E vnas vezes mandaua / como capitán guerrero, / otras como cauallero' (ll. 136-138), but in spite his valiant efforts, he is badly wounded and his banner thrown to the ground by Breçayda. He admits defeat, appeals to this lady to spare him and offers to be her servant, but to no avail: 'mandome luego leuar / a la su prisión tan fuerte, / donde maldigo mi suerte' (ll. 187-189). Thus the poet, having fallen in love with Breçayda, becomes a prisoner of war in the battle of love. The analogy between falling in love and becoming a prisoner is sustained throughout this poem with the metaphoric framework of the *cárcel de amor*. The language used throughout is very much that of conflict and combat, beginning with the sound of trumpets and the fact that 'pensamiento', representing the poet's innermost thoughts, is in a watch-tower on the look-out for the enemy's approach. When the poet and Breçayda confront each other with their 'tropeles', the meeting is described in terms of a battle, as the title of the poem anticipates. The trappings of war such as 'vandera' (l. 73) and 'estandarte' (l. 96) contribute to the atmosphere of conflict, together with the imprisonment of the poet after his defeat.

This poem differs from Gómez Manrique's other love poems in that it is not addressed to any woman and, rather than revelling in the idea of being in love, the poet is attempting to resist the temptation of it. It has similarities with a section of the poem *Sueño*, one of a trilogy of love poems by the marqués de Santillana (Santillana 2003: 233-258). In this allegorical piece the poet seeks to find the meaning of a dream that he has had, and in his wanderings meets and heeds the advice of Teiresias, a figure of classical mythology who was famed for his wisdom. He warns that we are all ruled by Fortune and that there is only one way of escaping the hold she has upon us: 'este es el libre albedrío, / por donde nos governamos' (245, ll. 263-264). Santillana's poem appears to take a more moral, and even theological, stand than Gómez Manrique's *Batalla de amores*, with its mention of the idea of free will and the advice to the poet to seek the help of Diana, the goddess of chastity. A battle ensues between the forces of

Diana and those of Venus and Cupid and the language used by Santillana to describe this fictitious battle scene uses the vocabulary of warfare in the same way as Gómez Manrique does and may well have influenced him. Santillana's poem ends in much the same way as Gómez Manrique's, as the poet is defeated and finally suffers imprisonment: 'Del qual soy aprisionado / en gravísimas cadenas, / do padesco tales penas / que ya non vivo, cuytado' (ll. 537-540).

Two Suplicaçiones

A variation in the way the poet addresses his lady comes in the form of an appeal to her not to ignore him, the subject of two pieces called *Suplicación*. One of these, 'No señora desenharpes' consists of three nine-line verses with a *fyn* of four lines (Gómez Manrique 2003: 119-120). The poet beseeches the lady not to forsake him because he will always be faithful to her, declaring in the first line, 'No señora desenharpes' and in the fourth, 'fará lo que tú mandares', thus emphasizing in the rhyme scheme that if she is true to him he will do as she bids. This promise is developed in the second half of the verse when he uses the trope of the lover as servant and incorporates the words 'amador' and 'servidor' at the end of the sixth and ninth lines to emphasize his promise. The repetition of the verb 'desenparar', twice in the second stanza and once in the third, reinforces the poet's message. Gómez Manrique also uses the figure of *annominatio*, referred to by Averçó as *paronomazia* (Averçó 1956: 291-292), in this poem since different parts of speech derived from the same root occur here. The verb 'vivir', for example, is used in each stanza to express his lifelong devotion to the woman, as is the noun 'uida' in the second verse to say that life will not be worth living without her. Similarly, the verb 'servir' or the associated nouns 'sieruo' and 'seruidor' are found in each stanza and help to place the focus of the poem on the poet himself. His aim is to convince the woman that by rejecting him she will be acting foolishly, as he says at the end of the first verse, 'que nonada ganarás / en perder tal servidor' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 119, ll. 8-9) and again at the end of the third, 'e verá ser conoçido / error a quien ha servido / dexarlo desanparado' (ll. 25-27).

The second poem with the same title, '¡O vos, la más linda dama', is of six stanzas each of eleven lines (135-137). This is also an appeal to the lady to respond to the poet's feelings for her, as its title suggests, but here the focus is on the woman and the attributes that the poet finds attractive in her. The appeal is structured so that in the first half of each of the first five verses the poet alludes to one of her fine qualities and she is described as beautiful, elegant, prudent, 'gentil y bien criada' (l. 35) and finally as

‘morada de discreción, / templo de gran perfección’ (ll. 46-47). The second part of each verse contains an appeal to the lady to respond positively and put an end to the poet’s suffering. The sixth verse consists only of a final appeal to the woman and echoes what the poet has already said on the subject of how much he suffers. Gómez Manrique starts each verse with an apostrophe to the lady which is followed by superlatives to express his appreciation of her attributes, as for example in the first two lines of the poem: ‘¡O vos, la más linda dama / de quantas biuen agora!’. In the first two verses an apostrophe is used again in the third and seventh lines with a superlative in an attempt to win over the lady addressed.

Each stanza of this poem follows the same metrical pattern, with the use of a rhyming *pie quebrado* in the seventh and tenth lines to stress the point being made. In the first stanza, for example, ‘e mejor’ (l. 7) sums up the poet’s opinion of the woman while the rhyme with ‘e dolor’ (l. 10) stresses pain. In the fifth stanza the contrast between the state of mind of the woman and that of the poet is brought into focus in the *pie quebrado* when her eyes are described as ‘no turbados’ to demonstrate her lack of engagement with her admirer. The poet, on the other hand, only receives ‘continuos enojos / e cuydados’ (ll. 53-54). The rhyme scheme of this poem, ABBBACdECdE, is carefully arranged so that the rhyming lines often refer to one particular concept, especially in the first half of each stanza. A good example of this is the second stanza where the second, third and fourth rhyming lines are really saying the same thing in order to emphasize the woman’s excellence. These lines are enclosed within the poet’s apostrophe of the first and fifth lines where the rhyming adjectives ‘graçiosa’ and ‘fermosa’ complete this part of the woman’s description. In the closing lines of the *fyn* Gómez Manrique uses antithesis to enhance the impact of the rhyme scheme and to make the end of the poem more striking. His final appeal to the lady is ‘¡O vos, la cuya bondad / e fermosura / ordena todo mi daño, / vsando de pñadad / e de mesura, / poned fin a mal tamaño’ (ll. 61-66). In these lines her ‘bondad’ and ‘pñadad’ together with her ‘fermosura’ and ‘mesura’ are juxtaposed with the poet’s ‘daño’ and ‘mal tamaño’ which epitomize the theme of the poem.

Parting and Separation from the Beloved

Another example of how Gómez Manrique varies the *inventio* is found in *Clamores para los días de la semana* (141-145), one of four poems on the theme of separation. This poem of seven stanzas of *octavas* is what is known as a ‘poema colectivo’, a practice whereby a poet incorporates lines from other poets into his own

work. Pere Torroella's 'Tant mon voler s'es dat a ·mors' which incorporates no fewer than 28 stanzas by other poets into his poem is an example of this (Torroella 2004: 64-95) as is Francesc Ferrer's *Lo conhort* (Ferrer 1989: 225). Here Gómez Manrique takes a quatrain from another poet as an *estribillo* to follow each of his verses. The *estribillo* for Monday appears to be anonymous (142n), Tuesday's is taken from Suero de Ribera (142n) and the one for Wednesday from Diego de Sandoval (143n). An anonymous quatrain in a mixture of Catalan and French follows Thursday's verse, whilst Macías (144n), Juan Rodríguez del Padrón (144n) and Santillana (145n) provide the refrains for Friday, Saturday and Sunday respectively. The poet speaks of his despair and solitude with a considerable amount of hyperbole. Gómez Manrique shows his skill in carefully matching the rhyme scheme of the final four lines of his linking stanzas to those of the quotations from other poets.

Apartamiento, 'Con vuestra merced quedó' (118-119), is a simpler poem of three *octavas* about separation and love-sickness. Anadiplosis is a stylistic device found in this poem, the first verse ending just as the second begins with the words, 'con cuydado'. This is followed by the words 'tan singular' to describe the lady concerned which occur at the end of the second verse and the beginning of the third. These lines also form the *pie quebrado* of stanzas one and two respectively, a device used in the sixth and eighth lines of each verse which makes the statement more emphatic due to the interruption of the rhythm. The *fyn* of this poem reminds us of its opening lines with its repetition of the verb 'partir' in the final two lines, 'Señora, de vos amar / no partiré'. Here Gómez Manrique is using the verb 'partir' not with the thought of physical separation from the woman, but in the abstract sense to convey the idea that he is still with her in spirit when not in her actual presence.

Sentimiento de partida, 'Yo parto de vos, donzella' (133-134), is also on the theme of separation but shows greater skill at using words to their full rhetorical effect. The use of anaphora with 'Yo parto' starting the first, third and fifth lines of each verse (with only a slight deviation from this pattern in the fifth verse) is an example of this figure of speech. In addition, to reinforce the point he is making, *annominatio* is noticeable as words derived from the same root as 'partir' are used such as 'partida' (l. 6), 'apartado' (l. 10) and 'la mayor parte de mí' (l. 28). In the third verse the poet makes the point that although he is leaving the woman behind, she remains in his thoughts, using the verb 'partir' twice in one line: 'yo parto, mas no se parte / sienpre de vos mi pensar' (ll. 21-22), thus conveying the idea of emotional proximity despite the physical space between them. Another stylistic feature of this poem is the anaphora that starts the

seventh line of each verse with ‘e lievo’ which is followed by a further expression of his feelings. He also juxtaposes words of opposite meaning in consecutive or alternate lines for antithetical effect, for example, ‘yo parto muy amador / de vos que voy desamado’ (ll. 12-13) and again: ‘Yo parto mucho contento / de vuestra gentil figura; / yo parto bien descontento / de vuestra poca medida’ (ll. 17-20). This brings into sharper focus the contrasting feelings that the poet and the lady have for each other.

La lamentación, ‘Avnque de vos me partí’ (152-155), also treats the theme of separation but here Gómez Manrique sets out to make a comparison between the despair experienced by a figure from the past, the poet Macías. The tone of this poem is certainly that of a lament and its title reminds us of the Old Testament book *Lamentations*, attributed to Jeremiah, which laments the destruction of Jerusalem. The comparison with Macías is appropriate since he was a poet renowned as a lover, referred to as ‘el grand enamorado’ by the marqués de Santillana (Mendoza 1984: 92) and, according to legend, died for his love. The extensive use of hyperbole contributes to the tone of lamentation, the verb ‘llorar’ occurring in the first two verses with the poet ‘llorando noches e días’ (l. 6) and declaring, ‘Llorando vuestra partida / mis ojos se tornan fuentes’ (ll. 11-12) (Gómez Manrique 2003: 153). These lines are reminiscent of *The Lamentations of Jeremiah* where hyperbole is used in a similar fashion, for example: ‘For these things I weep; mine eye, mine eye runneth down with water’ and ‘Mine eye runneth down with rivers of water’ (Lamentations 1, 16; 3, 48). The tone of the poem changes in the third, fourth and fifth stanzas where the verb ‘maldecir’ is frequently repeated, with ‘maldigo’ occurring three times in the third stanza and repeated in the initial lines of the fourth and fifth stanzas. The poet curses the different factors that have led to his current state: his ‘contraria fortuna’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 153, l. 22), his lack of courage to declare his feelings, and Love, which has turned him into the servant of the woman he is addressing. He also curses the day of the lady’s departure and makes a veiled allusion to her name which is in some way connected to this day of the week. In further hyperbole he even curses the hour of her departure and gives another exaggerated description of his grief: ‘mis pechos regando / con el agua de mis ojos’ (ll. 46-47).

‘¡O sy nacido no fuera’ (168-170) is the lament for a lost love but in this poem Gómez Manrique sets out to recall the benefits and pleasure that he derived from this past relationship. Vidal González surmises that this piece was written for the poet’s wife, Juana de Mendoza, partly because the woman is addressed as ‘vuestra merced’ in the same way that Juana is addressed in the *Consolatoria* (168n). Whether or not this

poem was written for the poet's wife, its tone and content suggest a far greater emotional intimacy between man and woman than in any other of Gómez Manrique's love poems.⁷ In the introductory verse he expresses his present sadness, wishing either that he had never been born or that he could have died when he knew that he was still loved. The first two lines echo those of Job when he curses the day he was born: 'Why had died I not from the womb? Why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly? (Job 3, 11). He then compares this state of affairs with the time when, he tells the lady, 'vuestra merçed sentía / mis angustias y tormentos' (ll. 6-7), thus revealing the closeness they had once shared. The poet proceeds to reflect in the following four verses on the different aspects of their relationship that brought him comfort. Each of these four verses begins with 'quando' as the poet takes stock of the past and this word is repeated constantly as he adds to the list of memories. An example of the healing power of the relationship is demonstrated when he declares, 'Quando mis tribulaçiones / con vuestras consolaçiones / eran presto derramadas; / y mis llagas se curauan / con muy süaues blanduras' (ll. 13-17). He also recalls that their partings were only out of necessity: 'de pura fuerça forçadas' (l. 22) and gives the impression of being at peace with the world and surrounded by friends whilst the opposite could be said of his enemies: 'quando con vientos contrarios / ciauán mis aduersarios, / yo bogaua con los buenos' (ll. 38-40). With the departure of the woman, all this was reversed and he is prompted to see death as preferable to his present state. The *fin* begins with a series of lamenting exclamations and it ends black with the suggestion that he would take his own life if it were not against God's law.

Querellas de Fortuna, 'No partirme de querervos' (139-141), is another poem written as a lover's complaint in which Gómez Manrique varies his subject matter by placing the blame on Fortune for his unhappiness. The first verse which introduces the theme of the poem, the conflict between the poet's desire to win the love of this woman and Fortune's decision that this wish should not be fulfilled, contains an example of *annominatio* with the use of the verbs 'partir' and 'apartar': 'No partirme de querervos / por çierto más que a ninguna, / más apartarme de vervos / quiere mi negra fortuna'. The following four stanzas use the device of anaphora as they all begin with 'Esta' which refers to Fortuna. The first two of these verses focus on the woman, praising her for her attributes, but they also contain criticism because despite her beauty Fortune has made her 'menguada / de mesura' (ll. 15-16) and although she is 'graçiosa' (l. 17), she is not

⁷ In September 1480 Juana de Mendoza was appointed *camarera mayor* to the infanta Isabel and from then onwards lived at court, usually apart from her husband, (Rivera Garretas 2004: 43-44).

‘piadosa’ (l. 19) towards the poet. The following two verses focus on the poet who bewails his misfortune for falling in love with one who is destined never to reciprocate his feelings. The use of *annominatio* in stanza IV is noticeable when the poet says of Fortune, ‘e quiere que ser querida / no queráys’ (ll. 31-32). The sixth and seventh stanzas are a statement of the poet’s abiding devotion and the ‘fin’ is an admission of his perturbed state of mind. The *pie quebrado* occurs in the sixth and eighth lines of each verse and is integrated into the rhyme scheme to highlight the sentiment expressed. A good example of this is in the second verse where the woman is praised for her beauty which is ‘acabada’ (l. 14), but she is ‘menguada’ (l. 15) or lacking in moderation and here Gómez Manrique is also using antithesis since these words are really opposite in meaning. Antithesis occurs again in the fifth stanza with the rhyming ‘enemiga’ and ‘amiga’ in the second and fourth lines to contrast his feelings towards Fortune and the woman he loves, and it is used again in the seventh stanza. Here it is combined with hyperbole to increase its effect: ‘Los quales (enajos), sienpre creçiendo, / penan mi vida menguando / e mis angustias, plañiendo, / çiegan mis ojos llorando’ (ll. 49-52), with the use of the verbs ‘creçer’ and ‘menguar’ and the exaggeration of the effect of the poet’s tears.

The Pain of Unrequited Love

Two poems focus more particularly on the poet’s own suffering rather than praise of the woman. An example of this is the twenty-line, ‘Sy se ha de dilatar’ (160-161), where in the second line he refers to ‘esta pena tantalea’. Like Tantalus, the lover in the poem feels a strong attraction to the woman and yet knows that there are boundaries that he must observe in his relations with her when he declares, ‘el que mi vyda desea / no la deue dessear’ (ll. 3-4). This is not a case of unrequited love; the poet feels that he is encouraged by the lady who also appreciates his self-restraint since he says, ‘pues vos plaze que vos vea / y no vos ose tocar’ (ll. 7-8), thus showing that the courtly code of behaviour constrains any lascivious advances on his part. We are reminded of Tantalus again in the second verse when reference is made to the water that he was not able to drink and an analogy with the prohibition on physical closeness is suggested by the lines, ‘no se puede sostener / tal vida sy no se troca’ (ll. 11-12). Another allusion to classical mythology is made when Gómez Manrique refers to ‘la flecha de amor’ (l. 13), Cupid’s arrow. The final lines of the second stanza, ‘nunca deuiera naçer / quien tiene libertad poca’ are again suggestive of unsatisfied physical desire. The *fyn* contains the much-used metaphor of ‘fuego’ to denote passion, and the

poet, thinking of his loss of well-being, compares himself with a rock that is cracked by the heat of the fire.

In *Trobas a vna dama que le preguntaua cómo le yua*, ‘¿Queréys saber cómo va’ (161-164), rhetorical inventiveness consists of forming the poem as a reply to a lady who has asked after him. The first two of the nine stanzas tell with striking hyperbole how impossible it is for him to express adequately his grief. He declares that only half his troubles could be recounted ‘Si las tierras se tornasen / en blanco papel toscano, / los ríos se transformasen / en tinta’ (ll. 11-14) or, in other words, he would need a very large quantity of paper and ink to express himself adequately. In the following stanza he uses a traditional troubadoursque metaphor, comparing himself to a ship without a captain being buffeted by a storm. He continues in the fourth verse with the much-used antithetical figure of the ‘living death’ that he claims to be experiencing: ‘Ansí que muero biuiendo / y biuo triste penando’ (ll. 31-32). The rest of the poem contains praise of the woman’s beauty and a reminder to the woman that she is the cause of the poet’s grief. Thinking back to the time when he parted from her, he asks, ‘¿por qué estonçes no morí / por no morir cada día?’ (ll. 59-60). Anaphora is used with the repetition of the verb ‘morir’ in that question and the same figure of speech occurs in the *fin*. Here we are reminded of the question that the woman is supposed to have asked the poet and on which the poem is based. Anaphora occurs again when reference is made to the man’s suffering: ‘después que le vos llagastes / de llaga syn mejoría’ (ll. 85-86), but there is a final twist in the sentiments of the final lines with an allusion to classical mythology and the spear of Peleus.

A Poem Expressing Mixed Emotions

In the poem of twelve *octavas*, ‘¡O contra de mi querer’ (164-167), the poet addresses a lady whom he accuses of taking pleasure in his distress. The inner conflict that he claims to experience, due to the negative response he receives from the lady, is expressed in the opening stanza with three consecutive lines of antithesis as well as the figure of chiasmus in the second and third lines: ‘amiga de mi desgrado / pesante de mi plazer / plaziante de mi cuydado!’ (ll. 2-4). He sees a parallel in their lives as they are both vulnerable, but for different reasons: his life is ‘temerosa / como quebrado nauío’ (ll. 11-12) due to his infatuation with her. Her life, he thinks, ‘anda peligrosa / más que delgado vidrio’ (ll. 9-10) and in the third verse he pays her a somewhat grudging compliment by advising her not to look at herself in a mirror or she might suffer the same fate as the mythically beautiful Narcissus who fell in love with his own reflection

and subsequently died. It is not until the fifth verse that the poet explains that she is in danger due to the jealousy of other women who may plot to kill her. The tone of the poem changes to one of praise from stanza VII onwards and the poet impresses upon this woman that she stands out from other women much praised in the past. He makes allusions to figures of classical antiquity, alleging that neither Cicero nor Ovid would be capable of doing her justice were they to describe her and then declares that she may be compared with Vergil's Dido on account of her beauty, with Judith of the Old Testament for her fortitude, and with Homer's Penelope for her moral steadfastness. The *fin* of the poem echoes the first stanza in its content since it reminds us of how, in spite of the different feelings they have for one another, the poet and the woman are mutually dependent for their survival. She must heed his warnings to safeguard her life since her death would bring about his too, as he explains in the final four lines: 'Pues guardaos, ydola mía, / con grande solitud, / sy no mi vida y salud / con la vuestra finaría'.

Advice to Other Lovers

Gómez Manrique gives advice on the subject of love in two of his poems. The intention of the *Carta de amores*, 'A ti, señora, de quien' (113-117), was to present the lady with what purports to be a letter, since the poet refers to 'la triste / e presente letra mía' (ll. 5-6), 'esta letra triste' (l. 59) and 'estos tristes renglones' (l. 71). This is a poem of seven nine-line stanzas followed by a *cançión* of twelve lines. The first two verses contain a fairly standard lover's lament on the subject of the sadness of separation. At the end of the third verse, however, he develops the theme by introducing a warning to other lovers, saying that they should be aware of what has happened to him. He declares that if they wish to remain happy, they should not follow his example and remain loyal to a woman who does not reciprocate their feelings: 'Por tanto, requiero aquí / a los que ledos desean / ser que leales no sean / parando mientes a mí' (ll. 28-31). In spite of this he intends to remain faithful to the woman, retaining his motto of '*verdad e fe*' (l. 35). This promise is reiterated in the fifth verse, and again in the verses which follow, as well as in the *cançión* which ends the poem. The only originality of this poem lies in the way Gómez Manrique presents it as a letter to a woman so that she may know of her lover's steadfastness in spite of the hurt that she has caused him.

Another poem, bearing the rubric *A vnos galanes*, 'Quien el fuego mucho atiza' (170-172), differs from the others discussed so far in that, as its title suggests, it is not addressed to a woman. It is immediately noticeable that the language is more

conversational and reminiscent of the style of many of Gómez Manrique's *preguntas y respuestas*, with the first stanza opening with two proverbial sayings, the first being 'Quien el fuego mucho atiza / a las vezes lo mató' and the second, 'nunca moho la cubrió / a la piedra mouediza'. The poet ponders on the question of whether there are advantages in switching one's affections from one woman to another and expresses a view on loyalty that contradicts the advice offered in the *Carta de amores*. The first of the four stanzas ends with an appeal to the 'galanes' who have not remained steadfast in their devotion to one woman: 'dezidme sy os va mejor / en tener más alegría / o menos pena' (ll. 8-10). In the second stanza he reflects on the adage 'God helps those who help themselves'⁸ and yet observes that in his experience not one of those who has acted upon this has benefited from such a move. In fact, he declares in the third stanza that these 'galanes' are worse off and he now sees them as marginalized when he compares them to what they were in their former situation, saying, 'que yo muy bien vos dexé / avezindados de juro / al mercadal; / agora, quando torné, / fállouos çerca del muro, / en el rual' (ll. 25-30), suggesting that their behaviour has excluded them from courtly society whose ethos demanded loyalty and devotion. The use of the *pie quebrado* in this stanza is particularly effective, with its stress on the contrast between the 'mercadal' the young men formerly frequented and the 'raual' which is where they now belong. The *fin* of this poem exhorts all loyal lovers not to lose heart and reproaches the others for the hastiness of their actions. Here Gómez Manrique again uses a colloquial saying to make his point in the final three lines of the poem: 'pues vos pueden conparar / que fuestes en la tardança / agua en çesta'.

A *Carta de buena nota* attributed to Gómez Manrique

The ethics of courtly love reached out beyond verse composition; having just discussed the subject of the giving of advice to lovers in two poems, I think it fitting at this juncture to mention an article by Carmen Parrilla in which she draws attention to two previously unpublished prose letters included in a manuscript in the Biblioteca Colombina in Seville (Parrilla García 1986: 341-350). One of these letters is certainly anonymous, bearing the rubric *Carta de buena nota*, and requests advice from the addressee on how to react after his lady has lost interest in him and the other letter is a reply, attributed in the manuscript to Gómez Manrique. A close examination of the manuscript by the writer of this article leads her to cast some doubt as to whether the

⁸ Although Gómez Manrique asserts that these people think they are 'ayudados de Dios' (ll. 11-12) there appears to be no biblical support for this and the adage quoted above is more likely to derive from Aesop's fables.

reply is really by Gómez Manrique because his name is written in different handwriting from the rest of the heading (342). This is not a strong argument and nor is her assertion that it is hard to reconcile the *respuesta* with the style of the author who wrote the *Regimiento de príncipes*, considering that Gómez Manrique wrote a large amount of love poetry like the compositions we have been considering in addition to his other poems of a more serious and reflective nature. While I do not contend that the *carta* and its *respuesta* necessarily belong to the same period as the *canciones* and *decires* discussed in this chapter, they reflect the concerns of the period and the way in which the concept of *gentileza* pervaded the cultural landscape.

The anonymous writer of the *carta* uses a series of metaphors at the beginning of his letter, the first being a comparison between the addressee and a falcon as he assumes that the poet, when in love, has been in a similar situation.⁹ Just as a falcon that flies readily towards a decoy is deceived by what it finds, so the poet is lured by the charms of a woman only to be disappointed. The second paragraph uses the familiar metaphor, of the ‘prison of love’ where the writer speaks of the ‘cadenas’ in which ‘este deus’ holds him, explaining that in his previous experiences of this ‘prison’ he had felt less closely confined. This time, however, he needs help and believes that the poet has the key to unlock his prison cell. The third paragraph uses another much-used metaphor, that of the ‘fire of passion’, which in the writer’s case has been extinguished, as he observes: ‘vino un agua tan sin tiempo que mató su propósito’ (77). He refers to the metaphorical prison again in the final paragraph of his letter when he appeals for help in either winning his lady or forgetting her because, if he does not achieve one of these objectives, ‘no avrá otra prisión en que haga presa sinon la muerte’ (78). The allusion to ‘este amor deus’ (77) at the start of the second paragraph implies that the obsession with love has taken the place of religion.

The reply to this letter, attributed to Gómez Manrique in the manuscript, shows that the writer was well aware of the ironic tone of the letter he has received. Furthermore, he dislikes its anonymity, protesting that it mocks him: ‘me pesa porque queréis conoçerme para burlar y no queréis que os conozca para loaros’ (78). He does, however, acknowledge that his present state means that ‘todas las pieças de mis defendimientos [el amor] ha desbaratado y desguarneçido’ (79). The advice meted out in the reply reflects both the attitude of the courtly lover and that of the misogynist, since the writer first suggests that his correspondent should never cease to serve the

⁹ Quotations from these two letters are taken from *Tratados de amor en el entorno de Celestina*, ed. Pedro M. Cátedra, (Madrid: Sociedad Estatal España Nuevo Milenio, 2001), 75-80.

lady. In the same sentence, however, he suggests ignoring the woman ‘porque las mugeres, mientras más las olvidan, más se acuerdan’ (79). The next piece of advice is to appear happy and be seen laughing in the woman’s presence and, if that has no effect, to speak to her with ‘palabras ásperas’ (79). He should tell her that he will never return if this does not move her or even, as a last resort which is not really recommended, threaten to vilify her publicly. If he wishes to forget the woman he may seek solace in religion and, if this should fail, occupy himself with other cares. Finally, in advice that clearly derives from Ovid, he suggests imagining the woman as ugly: ‘Figuralda fea [...] no menos suzia que rota y trasquilada’ (80). In the final paragraph the ironic tone of the reply returns, when he declares, with a rather backhanded compliment, that he would like to meet his correspondent to judge whether his grief is as great as his discretion.

Torroella’s *Maldezir de las mugeres* and Gómez Manrique’s response

If there is doubt concerning the authorship of the reply discussed in the last paragraph, it may seem to be supported by the fact that some of the advice it gives about women has parallels with the attitudes found in the infamous misogynist poem of Pere Torroella, the *Maldezir de las mugeres*. Sometimes known as the *Coplas de las calidades de las donas* and written at some point before 1458, it which exists in seventeen fifteenth and sixteenth-century manuscripts (Archer 2001: 267) and was immensely influential. The work elicited a response from a number of poets, some of whom concurred with Torroella, but Gómez Manrique composed a spirited defence of the female sex in which he replies to eleven of Torroella’s thirteen verses, using the identical rhyme scheme (Gómez Manrique 2003: 191-202).

In his poem of thirteen stanzas, to use the version given in Archer’s edition of Torroella’s work (Torroella 2004: 202-220), the Catalan poet launches into a diatribe against the female sex, listing their defects. The initial verse reflects the feelings expressed in much courtly love poetry since Torroella complains that any man who seeks to court a woman sets out upon a path of self-destruction, because women evade the men who court them. He adds that they are contrary in pursuing men who are not interested in them and the last lines introduce a note of the cynicism that is to follow when Torroella states that women are ‘por sola tema regidas’ (l. 8). The use of word the ‘tema’ may be intentionally ambiguous as it can be translated as ‘fear’ or ‘obsession’. In his response to the first verse Gómez Manrique says that those who write about women in this way are guilty of malice since many women are born ignorant of wrongdoing, ‘naçidas / ynorantes maleficios’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 192, ll. 14-15), and it is in

their nature to hate it: 'porque de su condición / las maldades aborreçen' (ll. 86-87). Those women who err, however, should not be made to accept the shortcomings of men. Torroella's second verse claims that women are ruled by what they fancy and their apparent honesty is but an excuse for rejecting a man's advances. To this Gómez Manrique retorts that Torroella's remarks on female dishonesty are founded on 'manojos / de rayzes de maldad' (ll. 31-32) by a man who 'olvidó de cortesía' (l. 33) and he continues by saying that men are more dishonest. Torroella's third stanza likens women to three animal species: 'lobas' because she-wolves were traditionally believed to choose the worst male to mate with; 'anguilas' because eels are slippery to catch; 'erizones' because porcupines have a prickly exterior that discourages physical contact. Women have no appreciation of the finer human qualities in their admirers and are only interested in what they can gain from them. To this Gómez Manrique replies that women show considerable fortitude in resisting men's advances (ll. 50-54). In the fourth verse Torroella addresses other lovers, warning them that women express in public sentiments that are contrary to what they say in private, but Gómez Manrique refers again to the courage of many women who have faced death in order to retain their virtue (ll. 70-72). In his fifth stanza Torroella declares that women bask in the praise they receive for their apparent honesty, but will yield to any man who offers them what they demand. This elicits another accusation of spite from Gómez Manrique who claims that Torroella fails to appreciate the 'discreción' possessed by many women (l. 88). Torroella then alleges that some women may be elusive due to a physical defect they wish to conceal, but Gómez Manrique does not really respond to this, and instead asserts that it is always the man who makes the first move in any amorous advance and that even 'la más mala tiene / vergüena de requestar' (ll. 105-106). In addition he reminds his adversary that all men are born of women, a standard argument based on honouring one's mother.

These first six stanzas of Torroella's poem could all have been written by a rejected suitor, since they are mainly concerned with female behaviour in courtship, but after this Torroella's criticisms subsequently take on a more general character. The seventh verse accuses all women of being dishonest, duplicitous, inconstant and contrary, of forgetting absent admirers, and wishing to attract others instead. In reply to this Gómez Manrique objects that it is unreasonable to take such an extreme view and he cannot accept that such a judgement should be made on all women; 'no consiento / que ayan un apellido' (ll. 122-123). Gómez Manrique chooses not to respond to Torroella's eighth verse that claims that women take criticism badly, love flattery and

always choose what is forbidden rather than what is considered appropriate for them. Torroella continues by arguing that because women are aware of the power that men exercise over them, they need to have recourse to cosmetics and body language intended to make them attractive. They are also mendacious and given to weeping or laughing for no reason. Gómez Manrique contests this stoutly with a reminder of the unblemished nature of many women, ‘muy más claras que vedrío’ (l. 137) and cites the example of Lucretia. In stanza X Torroella claims that women seek only pleasure and profit, that it is only out of fear that they are kept from wrongdoing, the one thing that makes it possible for men to live with them. Gómez Manrique declares that such criticism will not harm the good reputation of virtuous women and goes as far as to say that it is through the bad influence of men that women err: ‘Que si nuestra desauida / maluestad no interuiniere, / esta fe tengo creyda: / no ser ninguna naçida / que de lo tal presumiese’ (ll. 158-162).

In the eleventh stanza Torroella’s attitude softens a little when he refers to the Aristotelian definition of woman as being an imperfect man, ‘un animal [...] procreado en el defecto / del buen calor natural’ (Torroella 2004: 213, ll. 91, 93-94). Women’s failings, therefore, are natural and they are not to be blamed for their shortcomings. Gómez Manrique chooses to ignore this verse, probably because this Galenic concept of women was currently an ‘almost universally accepted medical notion of what they were’ (Archer 2005: 176). Moreover, Torroella seems to backtrack in the following stanza where he says that what reason women possess guides many of them towards behaving virtuously.¹⁰ This leads him to make a patronizing comment in his twelfth verse to the effect that this is all the more praiseworthy considering the defects that they possess naturally. These two stanzas prepare us for the palinode of the final verse when he declares that his lady is one of the few who deserve such praise: ‘vós sois la que desfaséis / lo que contienen mis versos’ (ll. 113-114). Gómez Manrique’s reaction to these final stanzas is to declare that Torroella is very much mistaken in his claims, expressing the opinion that women have the strength to rule the world, and finally reminding him that they are of God’s creation.

Torroella’s poem has to be seen as something of a marker in Castilian literature of the fifteenth century, as not only was it ‘uno de los más exitosos de toda la tradición cancioneril: aparece en nada menos que diecisiete manuscritos copiados entre la década de 1460 y 1541 (Archer 2011: 247), but it provoked a considerable response from

¹⁰ In some manuscripts l. 104 reads ‘así la parte mejor’ or ‘así la parte meyor’, both of which seem to make better sense in the context than ‘la parte mayor’.

contemporary writers. Although there is a long tradition of misogynous discourse, for example by Ovid and Boccaccio, and in Castilian prose literature by Martínez de Toledo, women had never before been portrayed in this way in Castilian verse (256). Indeed, they were always revered, and speaking ill of them was decried as the *Flors del gay saber* explicitly states, ‘quar degun temps lunhs bos trobadors que sia estatz lials amayres. no sentendec. en avol amor. ni en dezonest dezerier’ (Gatien-Arnoult 1841-1843: V, 360).

The fact that Torroella was from the Empordà and wrote nearly half of his work in Catalan is significant since there had been a tradition since the late twelfth century in Provençal literature of invective against women, originating with Bernart de Ventadorn. He and his followers developed the *mala cansó* in which, initially, individual women were denounced for the suffering they had caused the poet, but in some cases this led to general misogyny. Occasionally a misogynous *mala cobla* might even be inserted into a love poem, something Bernat himself famously did and this *cobla* was included in Matfre Ermengaud’s *Breviari d’Amor*, a work whose cultural influence was still felt in the nearby kingdom of Aragon in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and led to the development of the Catalan *maldit* (Archer 2011: 260-261). Some of these poems were directed at one woman in particular, but others were denunciations of women in general. Thus it is reasonable to assume that had Torroella written his *Maldezir* in Catalan he would have been following a tradition that was firmly established in Catalan literary culture and would not have made a great impact. To express these views in Castilian was an act of cultural transference that shocked because ‘tanto la difamación de las mujeres en general como el vituperio de una dama en particular eran géneros poéticos prácticamente desconocidos en la lírica de cancionero castellano’ (256). Moreover, Torroella’s palinode in the final stanza did not succeed in dispelling the negative tone of his work.

Archer claims that Gómez Manrique’s primary concern in writing this reply to Torroella was not so much to defend women as to decry the lack of *cortesía* that it expressed: ‘la intención principal de Gómez Manrique no es defender a las mujeres. De hecho, la mayoría de sus palabras van dirigidas contra los maldizientes, y sobre todo contra Torroella’ (281). He quotes Gómez Manrique as saying that Torroella ‘olvidó la cortesía’ (281) and, to support this opinion, it could be added that the reply contains a number of accusations against Torroella of malice, such as in the first stanza when he says that anyone who criticizes women ‘de la verdad refuye / e con maliçia consigue’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 192, ll. 12-13) and again in line 83 when he opines that the

poem is founded on ‘maliçia’. The *coplas* are ‘llenas de maldezir’ (l. 103) and the verb ‘maldezir’ occurs again later in the poem when he asserts that to write in this way is foolish since the defamer only defames himself: ‘maldezir es desvarío’ (ll. 138), referring to Torroella’s work as ‘vuestra difamación’ (l. 154). In this way Gómez Manrique shows himself to be offended by the content of this poem, but he obviously enjoyed the cut and thrust of debate with other writers and courtiers, as the number of *preguntas* and *respuestas* in which he participated bears witness, and by engaging in this debate he was earning himself a certain prestige in court and literary circles.

In commenting on Gómez Manrique’s response to Torroella, Archer overlooks the fact that it contains a number of criticisms of men in an effort to set the balance straight between the sexes. In the first stanza of his reply Gómez Manrique sets the tone of his defence when he warns against being too judgemental towards women who have erred from the straight and narrow, suggesting that men might do well to consider their own weaknesses: ‘e las qu’en ellos [maleficios] caídas / non deuen ser retraídas / acatando nuestros vicios’ (ll. 16-18). Vidal González suggests that this is an allusion to John’s gospel (192n), referring to the story of the woman who, caught in the act of adultery, is saved from the Pharisees’ judgement that she should be stoned to death when Jesus challenges any man who was free of sin to cast the first stone. Gómez Manrique clearly sees an element of hypocrisy and self-righteousness in the stance adopted by Torroella and seeks to counter this in his response by mentioning some of the shortcomings of men. On the subject of dishonesty he declares ‘de la desonestidad / nosotros somos la guía’ (ll. 35-36), and on men’s moral weakness, that women resist men’s advances resolutely, ‘venciendo nuestra flaqueza / con vna tal fortaleza’ (ll. 53-54). In another verse he states that in comparison with many upright women, ‘nuestras obras son prietas’ (l. 139) and elsewhere he makes a reference to ‘nuestra dasauida / maluestad’ (ll. 159-160). He thinks it is unjust that all women should be subject to this blanket criticism, since those who have erred have copied male models: ‘no consiento / que ayan un apellido / las buenas, que son sin cuento / e las que an con mal tiento / nuestros consejos seguido’ (ll. 122-126).

In this reply to Torroella Gómez Manrique is surely going beyond the mere defence of courtliness in poetry. Had this been his sole intent he need not have responded point for point to Torroella, but instead could have written something more akin to the *respuesta* of Suero de Ribera, which does little more than focus on the concept of courtliness and how it is the preserve of those of noble birth. In his *Respuesta en defensa de las donas* (ID 0199, Dutton 1990: II, 7-8; Pérez Priego 1990:

142-144) Suero states in the first stanza that it is demeaning for a man to write ill of women, as this is due to ‘sobra de malicia’ (l. 7). In the second stanza he suggests that to write as Torroella has done flaws an ‘hombre de buen linage’ (l. 11) who would be better advised to write ‘usando de cortesía’ (l. 16). He begins the third stanza of his poem by commenting that it is natural for those of lowly birth to express themselves without discretion, but ‘los fidalgos han de ser / defensa de las mugeres’ (ll. 23-24). Insistence on a gentlemanly stance in these matters is repeated in the following verse which opens with, ‘En boca de gentil hombre / mal está la villanía’ (ll. 25-26) and ends with the declaration that men are the first to make advances to members of the opposite sex. Because of this fact, he advises in the fifth verse that female indiscretions are best ignored: ‘callar es gentileza’ (l. 36). The *fin* of the poem contains an appeal to all men to refute any criticism they may hear of the opposite sex.

It is also worth mentioning that in his *Doctrinal de la gentileza* Gómez Manrique’s friend, Fernando de Ludueña, also defended the behaviour of women at court from the type of criticism that Torroella was making. He maintains that it is a part of court life for a woman to participate in the game of courtly love-making, and to condemn her for so doing ‘nunca fue tan gran error’ (ID 1895, Dutton 1990: II, 394-406). He remarks further that some people will automatically think the worst of the woman: ‘y la ley lo determina / quel de condición maligna / sienpre piensa lo peor’ (ll. 1114-1116).

To posit the argument that Gómez Manrique’s reply to Torroella reveals an incipient pro-feminine stance would obviously be a wild exaggeration, but it is significant that he chose to participate in this debate about the demerits and virtues of the female sex and sought to offer a more just and balanced view of women that went further than a debate about *cortesía*. Torroella’s criticisms are obviously a series of generalizations and sweeping statements which many readers of the time found untenable. Gómez Manrique came from a social class in which women, although not expected to play a dominant role in society, were nevertheless often well educated. We know that it was at the request of his wife, Juana de Mendoza, that he composed a religious poem which bears the rubric *Los cuchillos de dolor de Nuestra Señora puestos en metro por Gómez Manrique a ynistançia de doña Juana de Mendoza, su muger*. Juana was a friend of Teresa de Cartagena, the nun who wrote the *Arboleda de los enfermos* and subsequently defended her right to engage in such an activity in her treatise *Admiración operum Dey*. The only existing manuscript copy of this second work has a heading that states that it was written ‘a petición e ruego de la Señora Doña

Juana de Mendoça, muger del Señor Gomes Manrique' (Cartagena 1967: 111). Gómez Manrique was certainly aware of Teresa's efforts and may well have read the *Arboleda de los enfermos*, since in the introduction to her defence Teresa writes to Juana, 'me dizen [...] que el ya dicho bolumen de papeles borrados aya venido a la notiçia del señor Gómez Manrique e vuestra' (114). Although these are only snippets of information, they suggest that Gómez Manrique was sympathetic to Teresa's literary endeavours and more generally to female interest in both literary and spiritual matters. Together with his response to Torroella they support the view that he realized that women's lives could embrace more serious preoccupations than the author of the *Maldezir de las mugeres* would have us believe.

As Julian Weiss remarks, 'The debate over women in fifteenth-century Castile was not exclusively about the female sex, but 'is inextricably linked with a range of other ideologies that structure social castes and classes, notions of race, morality and medicine' (Weiss 2002: 242). By engaging in the debate about women Gómez Manrique appears as a player in what scholars in recent years have referred to as the drama of 'male anxiety' which was experienced by those in power and close to the crown in the fifteenth century when certain figures did not fit the conventional role-models expected of them. The weakness of Juan II as a monarch is well documented and during his minority his mother, Catherine of Lancaster, acted as a co-regent. Pérez de Guzmán's description of her suggests that she did not conform to the traditional stereotype of a woman when he remarks, 'En el talle e meneo del cuerpo tanto parecía onbre como muger' (Pérez de Guzmán 1965: 9). Juan II's son, Enrique IV, was also an extremely weak king who attracted accusations of effeminacy from his enemies who began to wage 'political battles on the ideological terrain of sexuality and gender' (Weiss 2002: 240), fearing that the strength of male dominance in the social hierarchy was threatened. It is significant that the twenty years of Enrique's reign were eventful ones in the life of Gómez Manrique. We cannot date his reply to Torroella, but if it was written after the death of the *infante* Alfonso in the summer of 1468 this 'male anxiety' would have been heightened, since the only two serious contenders for the crown of Castile were Isabel and her rival, Juana, whose legitimacy was in question. Until now I have omitted a point made by Gómez Manrique in his reply to Torroella when he says that women 'por su valor / podrían en derredor / el mundo todo regir' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 201, ll. 178-180). This suggestion that women's qualities and moral fibre were sufficient to enable them to wield power raises the general tenor of the debate far above and beyond the mean-spirited assertions of Torroella on the subject of female behaviour

in love. Arguably Gómez Manrique was in a sense paving the way here for the idea of the acceptability of an *infanta* as a pretender to the throne of Castile.

In this chapter I have tried to give an impression of the literary environment in which Gómez Manrique found himself in the first half of the fifteenth century when he began to write love poetry. He would have been acutely aware of the necessity of adhering to the rules applying to the composition of courtly lyric that would have circulated in Castile at the time. In addition he would have had to contend with the competitive atmosphere that existed among his peers where there was pressure to create lyric verse to impress those present at court. The subject matter varied little, but it was of supreme importance to find innovative ways of treating the same themes associated with courtly love in the restricting metres of the *canción* and the *decir*. It was in this part of his work that Gómez Manrique honed his skill as a poet by using numerous rhetorical devices, often having recourse to traditional troubadouresque figures of speech and displaying some knowledge of classical literature. His response to Torroella demonstrates his awareness of a shift in attitudes towards the concept of courtliness. It also shows a desire to engage in debate with other poets, an activity that he pursued considerably during his career. He was thus laying the foundations on which to develop his skills further when he proceeded to compose verse on other subjects and in other forms.

Chapter II Two Elegies for Knights (1458-1460)

The Defunción del noble cauallero Garçía Laso de la Vega

Garcilaso de la Vega and Gómez Manrique had close family links with one another, both being related to the marqués de Santillana and furthermore, as Harry Sieber reminds us, two of Garcilaso's sisters were married to two of Gómez Manrique's brothers, Rodrigo and Fadrique (Sieber 1989: 283). According to the first stanza of the poem Garcilaso died in 1455, but his death was recorded as having occurred in 1458 by some of the best known chroniclers of the age, Enríquez del Castillo, Diego de Valera and Alfonso de Palencia. In the poem we are not told exactly where he died but, according to R.B.Tate, he was killed in a skirmish against the Moors 'during an expedition to the Granadine *vega* organized by Enrique IV' (Pulgar 1971: 99). The chronicler Palencia records that Enrique IV, often seen as reluctant to engage in campaigns against the Moors, actually rejoiced when hearing that Garcilaso had been killed by a poisoned arrow, saying, 'Vamos a ver la fuerza mortal que tiene la pozoña, porque tengo entendido que le produce horribles gesticulaciones a García' (Palencia 1989-1990: 184). Pulgar gives another version of the story, however, when he alludes to this encounter in his *Tratado* and comments on the anger that Garcilaso's death provoked in the king, suggesting that Garcilaso was held high in the his esteem: 'con esta indignación mandó talar panes, árboles, viñas, huertas ... i tomó por fuerça de armas la villa i fortaleça de Mena i passaron a cuchillo a todos los moradores de ello sin reservar sexo ni edad' (Pulgar 1971: 99n). Pulgar emphasizes Garcilaso's bravery and heroism by telling us that 'este cavallero, ofresciendo su vida por la salud de los suyos, tornó con grand esfuerço a los enemigos, e tomando un paso, los impidió peleando con ellos tanto espacio que su gente se pudo salvar que no pereziese' (54).

The *Defunción*, a poem of 37 stanzas in *arte mayor* (Gómez Manrique 2003: 349-361), has its origins in the medieval Latin *planctus* or Provençal *planh* and conforms to the basic structure identified for this genre by Eduardo Camacho Guizado inasmuch as it contains the four elements traditionally included: the presentation of the event with the announcement of the death, the expression of sorrow and lamentation, the panegyric, and the consolation (Camacho Guizado 1969: 21). A striking feature of this poem is that it contains a substantial amount of narrative which enhances the announcement of the death. This was sometimes a feature of the *planctus* as Robert Archer remarks à propos the works of Ausiàs March: 'pot introduir-se una alusió al llinatge noble del difunt, abans de passar a la descripció del país o les persones que es

lliuren al dol' (Archer 1996: 51). Harry Sieber observes that the structure of the poem does not fully conform to that of the medieval *planctus*, commenting justifiably that it is impossible to divide it into discrete categories: 'it could be argued that some stanzas fulfil thematic functions belonging to other categories' (Sieber 1989: 281).

The announcement of the death occupies the first ten stanzas in which Gómez Manrique evokes the scene vividly with his description of the sound of battle. Not only do the cries and laments of the Spaniards fill the air, together with the clashing of weapons, but the triumph of the Moors, or 'perros paganos' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 350, l. 29), adds to the general cacophony: 'así los llorantes e los que reýan / con bozes discordes el campo atronauan' (ll. 15-16). The chaos of defeat is highlighted again in line 20 with the use of 'desacordado'; and the sense of grief heightened by the use of the verb 'llorar' or 'llorante' four times, 'gemidos' twice and other words such as 'sospiros', 'lágrimas' and 'plañían'. He stresses the fear of the routed Spaniards as they are defeated: 'Allí era el llanto con el miedo mezclado' (l. 17); and the deep impression the event has left on the survivors: 'avía rüydo, e tan espantoso, / que ninguno era tan poco medroso / que non estuiese asaz demudado' (ll. 22-24). Stanza IV ends with the observation that the 'lança temida' of the Moors has wrought death and injury on many of the Castilian soldiers.

It is not until stanza V that the narrator learns of the death of Garcilaso and there follows praise of Garcilaso, spoken by an anonymous informant. The dead man's skill as a warrior, his bravery and selflessness in the face of danger are emphasized. He died because he had refused to wear a 'bauera' (l. 47) since it restricted his movements and, like Achilles, he sustained a fatal injury to the only unprotected part of his body. Such were his valour and fearlessness and his many triumphs in battle that he is compared favourably with heroes of classical antiquity, in particular with Hector and Achilles: 'que non le fue más el fijo mayor / del buen rey troyano nin su matador, / por mucho que Omero lo pinte famoso' (ll. 54-56). Gómez Manrique attributes these qualities to the dead man's lineage, reminding us of his ancestor of the same name who, with his brother in a previous campaign, crossed the river Salado at great risk to himself, according to the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* (352n). We are also told that where Garcilaso met his death was also the place where he was knighted by the poet's brother, Rodrigo Manrique, whom he dubs 'el segundo Çid' (l. 71). Tribute is paid to the fact that he died defending the values of the Order of Santiago by fighting the Moors, and his noble lineage is stressed again as he had proved himself a worthy nephew 'del noble Marqués, señor de Buytrago' (l. 80).

The second section, the main expression of grief, begins at stanza XI where Gómez Manrique returns to the use of the first person narrative, intensifying his demonstration of personal sorrow at the sight of the dead man's body. Giving the impression of having been close to Garcilaso, he refers to him as 'aquel muerto que yo tanto amé, / que non más que a mí yo mesmo quería' (ll. 85-86) and his thoughts turn to the dead man's mother. There is much weeping and lamenting on the part of the poet and his companions whose feelings are compared with those of the Trojans on the death of Hector. This is hardly a true analogy since the Castilians were not prevented from giving Garcilaso a proper burial, whereas this is what the Greeks did initially to the Trojans on Hector's death, since Achilles gloated over his victory and had his chariot drag Hector's body around the walls of Troy for all to see. Gómez Manrique may have been mindful of this when earlier he comments on the reactions of the Moors: 'los moros quedaron / tañiendo añafíes, arbuérueras dando' (ll. 91-92). Three stanzas (XIII-XV) describe Garcilaso's funeral and the outpouring of grief on the part of all those present: 'allí fue llorado de los más onrrados / de toda la corte con gran sentimiento' (ll. 107-108). A tearful messenger is despatched to Seville to deliver the news of the death to the deceased's family.

The focus of this section on grief shifts at the start of stanza XVI and is seen in the context of Garcilaso's immediate family. The anxiety his mother has suffered on account of her son's exploits has left its mark on her physically: 'que todo su rostro estaua gastado / con las auenidas del muncho llorar' (ll. 125-126), but there is no doubt about her moral courage in the face of adversity, as her heart is 'más fuerte que roca' (l. 136). Although she is 'temerosa' at the sight of the messenger, she is also stoically resigned: 'non muncho turbada' (l. 137). It is noticeable how direct she is in the way she addresses him: '¿A qué vienes? / Dímelo ya; [...] no pienses que nada / me puede fazer más triste sin duda / que lo é seydo después de bñuda' (ll. 138-139 & 141-142). Her directness is in stark contrast with the messenger's discomfort and the difficulty he has in bringing himself to announce the news of Garcilaso's death. He is 'no poco turbado' (l. 128) on his arrival and when he starts to speak it is with 'vna boz gruesa del muncho llorar' (l. 145) and his narration is punctuated with 'su gran sospirar' (l. 148). In choosing to have the news of this death delivered by a messenger the poet is using a technique much used in the tragedies of Seneca, some of whose works were part of his library (Gómez Manrique 1885-1886: II, 333).

To prepare his audience for the bad news he has to announce, the messenger begins his speech by reminding Garcilaso's mother of her noble family's long history of

Stoic fortitude when confronted by misfortune. In stanza XX he alludes to the ‘valles y llanos’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: l. 154) which are safe from the ravages of war and disaster, unlike the buildings that are placed on ‘las cuestas e altos collados’ (l. 156). He continues with the observation that the poor have no understanding of such disasters and do not fear ‘los golpes que da la fortuna / a los que sostienen los altos estados’ (ll. 159-160). It takes the messenger four stanzas finally to deliver the news of Garcilaso’s death and this is seen as a defect by Alan Deyermond because his reflections ‘aplazan la respuesta que demanda la madre, prolongando así su angustiada incertidumbre’ (Deyermond 1987: 104). If, however, Gómez Manrique was recalling the Seneca he had read, he would have observed how the messenger always delivers a long speech to announce an event of great importance. Furthermore, the circumlocution in which he indulges serves to emphasize his own challenged fortitude in the face of tragedy, and his apprehension at the thought of being the bearer of such bad news. The length of his speech prepares Garcilaso’s mother emotionally to receive the blow that he is about to deliver.

The third part of the poem, the panegyric, commences in stanza XXII when the messenger launches into a eulogy of the dead man, saying how he was loved by all who knew him and feared by all his adversaries, that his valour was outstanding and that he died serving God and having made his final confession. The messenger has no doubt that his soul will be saved and offers consolation to the mother by declaring that the death should not be mourned, as her son did not die in vain but, ‘ganando por sienpre la celeste gloria, / dexando de sí perpetua memoria’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 194-195). Having finished his speech the messenger, despite his brave words intended as consolation, is described as drained of energy and grief-stricken himself: ‘Así concluyendo el reportador / a quien yua ya esfuerço menguando, / de lágrimas biuas sus pechos regando’ (ll. 201-203). The poet observes the irony of the fact that it is the messenger rather than the mother who is in need of consolation and this anticipates the role the mother will play after the death has been announced.

As a preface to the final, consolatory section of the poem the following four stanzas, XXVII-XXX, add to the narrative element of this work as they describe the scene immediately after the news has been broken: first complete silence and then hysterical weeping and tearing out of hair, initiated by the sister of the dead man and copied by the other women present except for the mother. Gómez Manrique compares their reaction with that of the Roman women who, on hearing the news of the battle of Cannae, uttered ‘palabras a Dios desplazientes’ (l. 229). The mother, however, is

depicted in a very different light, torn between her feelings of sadness and the need to behave wisely, but she is able to overcome her emotions and beg the others present to cease their lamentations: ‘desque con seso la furia vençia / del entrañable dolor maternal, / a ellas poniendo delante su mal, / que no llanteasen rogando dezía’ (ll. 237-240).

The final stanzas, XXXI-XXXVII, contain the consolatory fourth section of this poem, the response of Garcilaso’s mother which opens with an acknowledgement on her part that it falls to her to do the consoling when she is the person who ought to be receiving consolation. The demonstrations of grief around her only make her own more intense and she declares that it would be more reasonable for her to behave as the other women are doing. She quotes Aristotle on the subject of repeated misfortunes, saying that one consequence is that it makes the survivors ‘al fin no sentirlos con tanta pasión’ (l. 252). Pedro Salinas considers this a ‘pedante cita’ (Salinas 1947: 69) but Gómez Manrique clearly saw nothing anomalous about a woman of his time and class having such knowledge. Her reaction to the news is an expression of Christian doctrine which also shows the influence of Stoic thought when she reminds those around her that the world we live in is only a temporary dwelling like a ‘mesón’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: l. 256). We are all travellers on a journey on this earth ‘en el qual vedes que todos posamos / como caminantes por una pasada, / non lo teniendo por propia morada’ (ll. 257-259). She refers to this world as a vale of tears which we should not regret leaving and asks, ¿por qué nos quexamos, / [...] / en aqueste valle de lágrimas lleno / a do ningún día nin vn rato bueno / sin muchos malos auer esperamos?’ (ll. 260, 262-264). Here her words seem to echo those of Seneca in his consolatory epistle *Ad Marciam*: ‘What need is there to weep over parts of life? The whole of it calls for tears. New ills will press on before you have done with the old’ (Seneca 1932: 33). Although the mother shows her humanity and feels sadness on the death of her son, she shows resignation and acceptance of God’s will, quoting the famous words of Job: ‘Dominus dedit y Él lo tiró’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: l. 271). This quotation is also in harmony with the Stoic belief in destiny: ‘No man dies too soon, because he lives only as long as he was destined to live’ (Seneca 1932: 75). Her reactions are in marked contrast to those of the mother of Lorenzo Dávalos in Juan de Mena’s *Laberinto de la fortuna* when she learns that her son has been killed in battle. Stanzas XXXV and XXXVI relate how the mother’s words have a calming effect on the assembled company and how Garcilaso’s body was taken to be buried next to that of his father, with a repetition of the loud

lamentations of the previous day on the part of Garcilaso's sisters who did not restrain their emotions

There is hint of criticism of Enrique IV in stanza XXXV: 'Luego la fazienda fue toda gastada / por do más conuenía' (ll. 277-278), an allusion to the fact that, according to Palencia, Garcilaso's family asked that the *encomienda* of Montizón that he had been granted should be passed on to his infant son. This request was refused by Enrique who proceeded to confer it on one of his favourites, Nicolás de Iranzo, with the result that, 'A partir de este momento el rey se mostraba cada día más odioso a la nobleza, y cada vez más favorable a los villanos' (Palencia 1998 -1999: I, 184).

In the final stanza of four lines Gómez Manrique expresses the anguish he experienced on writing this poem and likens his feelings to those of the Trojan women on seeing Priam's reaction to Hector's death. There are other references to the Trojan War in this poem: one of these compares Garcilaso's military strength with that of Hector and Achilles (ll. 53-56). The feelings of the Spaniards at Garcilaso's death are compared to the Trojans' after Hector's death (ll. 89-90), all of which suggests that Gómez Manrique wished to demonstrate his knowledge of Greek literature. Some of this he no doubt gleaned from the copy of *La destrucción de Troya* which was included in the inventory of his library (Gómez Manrique 1885-1886: II, 332). This account of the Trojan War, however, is incomplete and breaks off with the arrival of the Greek fleet at Troy and a bloody encounter on the shore beneath the city walls (de Colonna 1970: 166-167). Also in his library was 'Un libro de Metamorfoseos' (II, 334), presumably Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, books XII and XIII of which would have provided him with part of the story of the conflict. He might also have read Juan de Mena's translation into Spanish of the Iliad which ends with the burial of Hector. The description of the lamentations of the Trojan women before his funeral pyre recalls similar scenes of grief at the death of Garcilaso: 'E ya estaban ay en derredor las madres troyanas rompiendo con delicadas manos los cabellos fermosos y rasgando e firiendo sus pechos' (Mena 1996: 221).

The *Defunción* appears to be the one poem by Gómez Manrique that has attracted attention from a number of scholars and with very different reactions. Augusto Cortina considered it 'de lo más hinchado y antipoético que produjo el autor', continuing with a reference to 'las plúmbeas estrofas de arte mayor', and invites the reader to analyse some examples of what he calls 'vulgarísima prosa rimada' (Gómez Manrique 1947: 16). Pedro Salinas, on the other hand, considers it is 'la más hermosa doctrina de la conformidad con el querer de Dios' (Salinas 1947: 69). His overall

judgement on the poem is highly favourable: ‘Los pormenores realistas, los cambios de lugar, la escena grandiosa de la notificación y la admirable respuesta de la madre, dan [...] una extraña mezcla de movilidad narrativa, nobleza dramática y altura moral’ (69).

Kenneth Scholberg in his monograph sees the influence of Mena and the episode of the death of Lorenzo Dávalos on Gómez Manrique, remarking on the different reactions of the two mothers. He finds fault with the way in which the mother’s lament is expressed: ‘Hay que admitir que el estilo demasiado literario del lamento de la madre disminuye su fuerza emotiva’ (Scholberg 1984: 25).

Alan Deyermond expresses some reservations about the poem, describing the opening stanza as ‘una de las peores introducciones a un poema importante que un buen poeta de cualquier idioma haya escrito nunca’ (Deyermond 1987: 99) and the ending ‘bastante floja’ (110). His interpretation of the messenger’s words in stanza XX is strange: ‘Es imposible creer que “los que pobrezillos que guardan ganados” no sufrieron tales pérdidas’ (105), reading into these lines an implication that the poor do not feel the pain of bereavement in the same way as the nobility. Gómez Manrique is surely reflecting on the greater vulnerability of ‘los altos estados’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 356, l. 160), the warrior class, who expose themselves to more danger than those of humble estate who earn their living on the land. To say that ‘la falta de simpatía humana no es sólo mimética, sino que se debe atribuir al poeta mismo’ (Deyermond 1987: 105) is untenable, particularly when one reads the following stanza XXI in which the messenger makes the point that the mother comes from a long line of noble ancestors who have experienced both triumphs and misfortunes ‘con gestos y iguales’ (Gómez Manrique 2002; l. 162). Gómez Manrique is surely merely suggesting that Garcilaso’s mother will be able to accept this latest reversal of fortune with the customary fortitude that her forebears have shown in similar circumstances. However, I think Deyermond is right in concluding that the *Defunción* is more than just an elegy: ‘es genéricamente más compleja, combinando una elegía con escenas dramáticas y con una poesía consolatoria’ (Deyermond 1987: 112).

Sieber also alludes to the financial loss suffered by Garcilaso’s family, of which there is a hint in stanza XXXV. He quotes from the mother’s will in which she provided for the orphaned grandson because ‘dél [Garcilaso] non quedó otra cosa’ (286). He comments that the Manrique family never forgot this slight but does not draw any political conclusions from this. This point is taken up and developed in some detail by Carl Atlee who concentrates on the political implications of the poem, citing the chroniclers, Enríquez del Castillo, Palencia, and especially Valera, to reveal Enrique’s

lack of esteem for Garcilaso (Atlee 2010: 175). In addition, Atlee analyses the literary techniques employed by Gómez Manrique to contrast Garcilaso's bravery with the king's disrespect for him, interpreting this poem as an 'implicit denunciation of Enrique IV' (169).

Gómez Manrique's letter to Pero González de Mendoza

A very different structure from that of the medieval *planctus* is to be found in Gómez Manrique's lament for the marqués de Santillana who died in April 1458. The poem itself is prefaced by a letter by Gómez Manrique to the marqués's son, Pero González de Mendoza, bishop of Calahorra (362-366). In the first paragraph, he excuses himself for not writing to the bishop before on the grounds that he himself felt in need of consolation. In fact, two years may well have elapsed before the poem was completed, since in lines 896-898 of the poem Poesía, as she laments the marqués's death remarks, 'qu'en espacio de dos años / tales me son fechos daños / por esta muerte maldita', which suggests that the poem was completed in 1460. The poet pays tribute to the qualities that Santillana possessed which were of benefit to the nation: he makes a comparison between the marqués and great heroes of antiquity such as Caesar and Livy and praises him also for being the first statesman of the time to take an interest in literary pursuits as well as being a soldier, a subject that surfaces elsewhere in his writing, namely in his letter to the conde de Benavente and in the *Regimiento de príncipes*. He states that Santillana was 'el primero de senblante prosapia e grandeza d'estado que en nuestros tyenpos congregó la çiençia con la cauallerya e la lóriga con la toga' (363). He can think of no one else of a similar status who took an interest in literature; in fact there were many who would rebuke a knight who devoted time to such activities, but the marqués fought successfully against this attitude: 'La qual errada opinión este varón magnífico arrancó de nuestra patria' (363). Tribute is paid to his skill in commanding troops on the battlefield and his bravery in the face of danger which were outstanding, and the combination of these attributes produced a person whose loss will be greatly felt by the people. Gómez Manrique sums up his feelings with a quotation from the prophet Jeremiah: 'Fynalmente, éste fue tanto en perfeçión bueno e proueçoso para esta rigión, que bien sin dubda ella puede dezir con Geremías que es quedada syn él como biuda señora de gentes' (363-364).

The second paragraph of this letter contains a very much more personal appreciation of the marqués and the author begins by saying that Santillana was like a second father to him. He recalls the favours and protection that he received from him

and also the encouragement and praise which, he claims, was undeserved. It was the marqués who encouraged him to write poetry, appreciated what he produced, and seems to have given him confidence in his own ability, since he says of his own efforts, ‘las quales (obras) por aquel muy noble señor mío tanto fueron aprouadas, que del todo tiró a mí el velo de la vergüeña’ (364). He does, however, indulge in many more topical expressions of modesty concerning the poem he is presenting.¹¹

El planto de las Uirtudes e Poesía por el magnífico señor don Yñigo López de Mendoza, marqués de Santillana

The poem begins with an invocation to God to inspire the poet and then launches into a description of an allegorical journey that forms the bulk of the poem. The scene is set initially in the spring with a description of nature, something not often found in Gómez Manrique’s poetry. Suddenly driven by the need for solitude he heads for a monastery. Losing his way, he finds himself in a dark and terrifying valley which is in stark contrast to the scene first described; instead of the nightingale’s beautiful song, he hears the ominous cry of owls. The atmosphere is made more sinister with the presence of poisonous snakes and the discordant cries of eagles which ‘por sus pechos reales / sacauan sus coraçones’ (ll. 144-145) and the realization that he is trapped in this place and can find no way out. He compares his plight with that of Jonah when swallowed by the whale and, as night falls, his fear grows with the increasing eeriness of his surroundings. He embellishes his description with classical references: he senses the presence of the Harpies when he would rather hear the music of Orpheus and feels as sad as Dido when Aeneas left her. As the following day dawns and he continues his journey, the poet sees a fortress before him which he approaches with misgivings: ‘Su fraguoso fundamento / bien manifiesto fazía / aver sydo su çimiento / vn triste recogimiento / para los syn alegría’ (ll. 361-365). Things get worse when he hears ‘vn tumulto que sonaua / de dentro tan dolorido’ (ll. 367-368) and he is still more downcast when he finds the stark interior by seven grieving maidens.

Three of these women are holding crosses and the other four have a coat of arms whose the emblems are described in some detail. At this point in the poem, in the margins of manuscripts MP3 and MN24, the names of three of the families from whom Santillana was descended are written: Mendoza, Ayala and La Vega, some of the great

¹¹ Gómez Manrique’s admiration of Santillana is expressed in a poem of 68 lines of arte mayor in which he requests a *cancionero* of his relative’s works (205-208); Santillana replies graciously using the same metre and rhyme scheme.

noble families of Castile.¹² It is at this point in stanza XLVI that the poet, recognizing these coats of arms, begins to fear that it is the marqués who has died. The seven maidens turn out to represent the Christian virtues of Faith, Hope and Charity and the Stoic qualities of Prudence, Justice, Temperance and Fortitude. The first to speak is Faith who sings Santillana's praises, saying that he was 'vn templo muy rico / de nuestra congregación' (ll. 501-502). She pays tribute to two other men, both clerics who died in 1456. One was Alfonso de Madrigal, El Tostado, of whom Fernando del Pulgar wrote, 'en la ciencia de las artes e teología e filosofía natural e moral, e asimismo en el arte del estrología e astronomía, no se vido en los reinos de España ni en otros estraños se oyó aver otro en sus tienpos que con él se comparase' (Pulgar 1971: 72). Faith declares that he was as knowledgeable on the subject of theology as Saint Augustine. The other cleric was Alfonso de Cartagena,¹³ also much praised by Pulgar for both his learning and his integrity, whom Faith compares with Saint Paul and Saint Gregory. This is praise indeed on the part of Faith, but her claims are even more extravagant when she speaks of the marqués. She pays tribute to his abilities as a soldier prepared to defend the Christian faith but also claims to have lost a man equal to Saint Thomas, presumably Saint Thomas Aquinas. Hope and Charity then express their sorrow by making comparisons between themselves and female characters from Homer. Charity pays tribute to Santillana's generosity and compassion by saying, 'Este fue, verdat vos digo, / de los míseros abrigo, / de los hambrientos fartura' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 616-618).

The four Stoic virtues then speak and Prudence, Justice and Temperance lament the loss of Santillana, mainly comparing him favourably with great men of the past such as Solomon, Aristotle, Brutus and Alfonso el Sabio rather than figures from mythology. Fortitude in her eulogy makes a reference to both characters from history as well as mythology and even she admits that she is 'nada fuerte / para comportar tristeza / ni para con gran firmeza / atender la cruda muerte' (ll. 772-775). Indeed, contrary to traditional Stoic principles, rather than accepting the death of Santillana with resignation, she too encourages others to lament, saying, 'Plangan conmigo que plaño / sus verdaderos amigos, / y lloren vn mal tamaño / e tan syn medida daño' (ll. 781-784).

The poet leaves this scene of lamentation only to meet with Poesía, personified as a young woman, who is also in mourning, and not just for Santillana, as she also

¹² Vidal González claims that the name Çisneros is also written in the margin of MP3 and MN24, but I can find no trace of this on the CDs that I have of both manuscripts.

¹³ Cartagena was the uncle of the nun, Teresa de Cartagena, who was a friend of Gómez Manrique's wife, Juana de Mendoza.

reminds us that in the last two years both Juan de Mena and Juan d'Ixar have died so that she now feels like a ship that has lost its captain or a city that has been depopulated. She asks the poet to take up his pen and write an appreciation of the great man. The poem at this point becomes somewhat repetitious as Poesya instructs the traveller to tell his audience of Santillana's genealogy and his personal attributes, all of which have already been praised by the Virtues. Gómez Manrique obeys these instructions and then proceeds to indulge in an encomium of the marqués, claiming that his writing was more elegant than that of Boethius and even claims 'pues en los metros el Dante / ant'el se mostrara necio' (ll. 1089-1090). He takes the opportunity at this point to remind us that Santillana was able to be a soldier as well as a man of letters, but finally excuses himself from the task that Poesya has set him on the grounds that she should find 'otra péñola más diestra' (l. 1155). Instead he suggests that Pérez de Guzmán would be better suited to the task.

The allegory of the poem is developed in stanza CIV when Gómez Manrique, responding to Poesya's request, declares that with the death of the marqués the seven Virtues have lost the site of their home: 'pues perdieron las manidas / do fazían su mansión' (ll. 1039-1040). Thus Santillana becomes the embodiment of both the Christian and Stoic virtues and his death is not just a cause of grief to those who knew him but to the whole of Castile, a concept that Poesya had already suggested in stanza LXXXVIII when she regretted the loss of Santillana as a beacon or shining example to Castile, a 'real alcandora' (l. 873).¹⁴ Towards the end of the poem there is, therefore, a marked shift of emphasis away from personal grief and a focus on the implications of this death for Castile. Gómez Manrique expresses his concern for the nation, believing that the loss of men such as Santillana has a destabilizing effect upon society. He sees the marqués as a vital member of society, just as a temple requires the pillars that support it. The notion that much can be learned from men of mature years is to be found elsewhere in Gómez Manrique's poetry, for example in his *Regimiento de príncipes* when he tells the young Fernando not to listen to 'moços apasionados' but instead to heed the advice of 'onbres de discreción, / de saber y lealtad' (633, ll. 112-114). Santillana's death, therefore, does not augur well for the future: 'E quando de los concejos / falleçen los cuerdos viejos, / vezinas son las discordias / que nunca moran concordias / do faltan buenos consejos' (415, ll. 1236-1240).

¹⁴ Vidal González gives the meaning of *alcandora* as 'camisa' in a footnote on page 401 of his edition of Gómez Manrique's *Cancionero*, but the dictionary of the Real Academia Española of 1726 gives 'Lo mismo que Hoguera, luminaria y todo género de fuego que levante llama, para hacer alguna señal', which seems more appropriate in this context.

A similarly gloomy note is sounded by one of the Virtues as she takes her leave of Gómez Manrique and pronounces on the state of Castilian society. She sees the immediate future as a period of sadness until someone of Santillana's qualities can be found and expresses a negative view of the contemporary situation, thinking that sin and vice have taken a hold on all social classes, or as she says on 'todos los tres estados' (l. 1284). Just as Poesía had declared in lines 1039-1040 (407) that the Virtues had lost their dwelling place, this Virtue uses similar imagery when, speaking for herself and the other Virtues, referring to the marqués as 'este en cuyo mesón / todas, todas ayuntadas, / sienpre fuemos ospedadas / sin otra contradición' (ll. 1287-1290), declaring that she and her fellow Virtues no longer have a home in the sinful society in which they find themselves. The allegorical part of the poem ends with the departure of the Virtue who has just spoken and the closure of the castle that the poet has visited.

It should be noted at this point, however, that Gómez Manrique exempts members of the royal family from the criticism of Castilian society uttered by the Virtue mentioned in the preceding paragraph because, in keeping with a medieval view of kingship, she says that they are 'casi diuinales, / por nuestro Dios elegidos / para sus reynos regir' (ll. 1274-1276). We know that the poet did not always support Enrique IV who was on the throne by the time of Santillana's death, but his diplomacy, or economy with the truth, can be seen in lines 1218-1220. Here he implies that the marqués and the Mendoza family always supported the crown, but he must have known that the young Santillana participated in several revolts initiated by the infantes de Aragón in fact changed his allegiance from one branch of the Trastámara dynasty to the other several times (Nader 1979: 47). In 1420, for example, the marqués supported Enrique de Aragón in the attempted coup known as the *secuestro de Tordesillas* when Juan II was taken prisoner. When Juan II and Álvaro de Luna managed to escape to the castle of Montalbán they were pursued and the castle was besieged by Enrique de Aragón, Santillana and others (48).

In the final four stanzas the poet gives his own reflection on the effect of Santillana's death, saying that Castile has become 'tan yerma ... , / como sin pueblo Cartago' (ll. 1314-1315). He then echoes the words, already quoted, that he spoke to Poesía on the advisability of listening to 'ancianos / sujetos a la virtud' (ll. 1319-1320) rather than to 'la loca jouentud' (l. 1317) since this was the secret of how ancient Rome prospered. The forebodings expressed by the last Virtue are mirrored in his use of the simile of the ship that comes to grief without its captain as an analogy with that of the society without upright men that is overrun by injustice. Finally he recalls the

invocation he made at the beginning of the poem to Jesus and now asks that He may protect Castile from the evil that he fears will overcome it. This statement, like that of the Virtue who speaks in stanza CXXIX, suggests very clearly a distinct unease on the part of Gómez Manrique regarding the state of Castilian society at the time.

A striking stylistic feature of this poem is the way that Gómez Manrique incorporates more than fifty similes that draw on a wide range of points of comparison. As Azaustre Galiana and Casas Rigall observe, ‘la comparación y el símil establecen una analogía entre dos términos a partir de una característica que éstos comparten en cierto grado; pero [...] tienen primariamente un valor ornamental, no probatorio’ (Azaustre Galiana and Casas Rigall 1997: 136-137), a statement that sums up Gómez Manrique’s use of the simile in this poem. The physical effects that can accompany a premonition of tragedy are vividly expressed by the poet: ‘mis sospiros no senzillos / doblauan como martillos / presurosos en la fragua’ (ll. 73-75). The poet’s desire to overcome his cowardice is emphasized when he compares himself with ‘quien come [...] / açíbar por la salud’ (ll. 181-182). In the same stanza he uses antithesis and another simile to demonstrate how he overcame his fears: ‘e la pura couardía / me prestó tal osadía / que, como desesperado, / quise fazer de mi grado / lo que fuerça costreñía’ (ll. 186-190). Later, as he continues his journey he uses another simile to show how alert he is: ‘como alcaide sospechoso, / sy callan los veladores / pospone todo reposo, / yo me leuanté quexoso’ (ll. 281-284). Caridat expresses her desolation saying, ‘quedo tan solitaria / como sin madre donzella’ (ll. 609-610).

There are a number of allusions to mythological characters of classical literature: the poet’s sadness is compared to that of Dido when Aeneas leaves her (ll. 246-250); his fear on approaching the castle’s drawbridge is like that of Theseus when he witnessed the death of Periteus.¹⁵ As in the Defunción, there are references to the Trojan War to emphasize the sadness felt by the Virtues whose lament is ‘más dolorido que las troyanas fizieron / la triste noche que vieron / su gran pueblo destruydo’ (ll. 512-515). Esperanza is described as ‘Con gesto más dolorido / que la biuda troyana / al punto que su marido / por las espaldas ferido / vido por lança greçiana’ (ll. 571-575) and bears this out when she speaks: ‘quedo más tribulada / que la muger desdichada, / nin la fija de Priamo’ (ll. 583-585). Caridad is compared with Helen: ‘no menos triste que quando / salió del tenplo gritando / la reyna griega robada’ (ll. 593-595); the sadness of Tenprança is ‘qual syn Étor los Troyanos’ (l. 732).

¹⁵ Vidal González’s footnote (382) is not helpful and refers to Tereo rather than Teseo who was a different person. Both MP3 and MN24 read ‘Teseo’.

Some similes are based on historical or biblical rather than mythological topics: Santillana's death is a greater blow to the kingdom than Hannibal's attacks on the Romans (ll. 657-660). Poetry is saddened like Virginea 'quando por sentença fea / fue por Claudio condenada' (849-850). In stanza VII the poet likens his disquiet to that of Simon Peter when his faith was challenged (ll. 67-70). He turns to the story of Jonah and the whale, comparing Jonah's fear with his own as he enters the dark and sinister valley and can find no way out (ll. 166-170).

The language of jousting and conflict is used by Justiça who declares that without the marqués she has been left 'como justador syn vara' (l. 710) and also by Prudencia: 'sin el qual (el marqués) queda mi nonbre / como yelmo syn çimera' (ll. 639-640). The poet's change of mood as he approaches the castle is illustrated by a comparison with physical strength: 'Con tan mudada color / como conbaten los muros / los que pungidos de onor / posponen todo temor' (ll. 321-324).

Nature is another source of simile in this poem, water being used in some analogies. Caridat extols the Christian charity of the marqués, using a frequently used comparison with a river: 'qualquiera que me buscaua / en él, cierto, me fallaua / bien como agua en el río' (ll. 613-615). The overwhelming task of writing a suitable eulogy of the marqués is for Gómez Manrique 'como faze quien se beza / a nadar en gran fondura' (ll. 1124-1125). The river is also used as it is in some of Gómez Manrique's love poems to express grief on the part of the poet: 'mas mis ojos porfiosos / como ríos caudalosos / fueron malos de agotar' (ll. 1008-1010). As the poet leaves the castle and the presence of the Virtues, the scene appears desolate: 'toda sola e desierta / la tierra d'estas donzellas, / la qual quedaua sin ellas / qual sin árboles la huerta' (ll. 1307-1310). The analogy between the maidens and the fruit trees implies that just as a tree provides fruit to feed us physically, the Virtues make a contribution to the spiritual and cultural nourishment of the nation. A similar comparison is made in the next stanza to reinforce this thought when Gómez Manrique remarks that without the marqués his country 'tan yerma parecía, / como sin pueblo Cartago' (ll. 1314-1315).

The idea that the poet embarks on an allegorical journey is emphasized by several similes in one of which he describes himself as 'como quien camina / por ventas en inuernada' (ll. 211-212) as he hastens to find a lodging before nightfall. More often the journey is illustrated with examples of the well-worn nautical topos to denote confusion or lack of guidance: 'E como çiego syn guía / o fusta syn gouernalle, / yua por do no sabía' (ll. 101-103). This idea is repeated while the poet is still on his journey: 'Como nao que se lança / a lo fondo con fortuna, / procurando segurança' (ll. 191-193).

Tenprança expresses her sense of helplessness in a similar way: ‘a la ora soy quedada / como en la mar alterada / queda la fusta sin remos, / a quien la mar faze guerra’ (ll. 723-726). Poesya laments the marqués’s passing in the same way: ‘yo soy quedada / qual la nao syn patrón’ and adds a further, non-nautical comparison: ‘o como cibdat poblada / quando finca despoblada / de toda su población’ (ll. 921-925). In the penultimate stanza the simile is developed further: ‘Que como syn los patrones / se ronpen çedo las fustas, / así bien syn los varones / de derechas intinçiones / pereçen las cosas justas’ (ll. 1321-1325), reflecting Gómez Manrique’s concern that Castile is currently lacking good leadership.

The animal world figures in some of Gómez Manrique’s similes, some of which are very simple, such as when the poet describes himself as ‘como toro judío (l. 171) to express his lack of bravery at the prospect of learning bad news. The poet introduces Poesya as ‘como fiera leona, / desgarrava su persona / con vna rauia feroz’ (ll. 866-868) to emphasize the strength of her feelings.

Birds figure in another simile when Gómez Manrique addresses Poesya on the recent loss of Santillana and other poets, comparing her to a falcon unable to fly after being shot down:

Pues que fincades desnuda
como falcón quando muda
sus plumas al derribar,
que las unas le falleçen
e las otras no le creçen;
así vos son falleçidos
estos varones sentidos
e otros no remaneçen (ll. 1043-1050).

Here the community of Castilian poets is analogous to the falcon as it takes to the wing. The feathers that enable it to fly are the individual poets, some of whom die and are not replaced.

Birds are also included in a more complex analogy of two linked comparisons that make up stanza IX:

Que como el enfermo syente
la del tienpo mutaçión,
asý bien por consyguiente
el infortunio viniente
sentía mi coraçón.
E como con tenpestad
fuyen a la sequedad
las aues de la marina,
procuré por melezina
correr a la soledad (ll. 81-90).

In the first five lines we have an analogy between a sick man, whose physical condition makes him vulnerable to a change in the weather, and the timorous poet as he senses imminent misfortune. The second half of the stanza compares the poet's reaction to his circumstances, but retains a link with the first half: the feared change in the weather has now become a 'tenpestad'. The poet, in searching for a 'melezina' for his malaise, takes one step further than the sick man of the initial lines, because he takes action by seeking solitude, just as sea birds leave their natural habitat of the ocean and retreat inland away from the storm. To apply Archer's theory of simile to this stanza, Gómez Manrique is using two images, the sick man and the sea birds, and comparing them with one referent, the poet. Although much simpler than the Marchian simile analysed by Archer, it is possible to find in these lines 'a certain amount of implicit material that might be deemed to attach itself to the literal correlatives' (Archer 1985: 58). The poet is not physically ill, but he is in a mentally fragile state. The second line of this stanza could be interpreted as a play on words: 'tienpo' referring to 'time' and therefore an allusion not only to the new era that dawns after Santillana's death, but also to the changing political climate in which the poet is living. The storm the birds try to avoid can be taken in the figurative sense, referring to the emotional turmoil in which the poet finds himself which drives him into the wilderness.

In spite of the large number of similes in this poem there are few metaphors. The final stanza opens with one when the poet declares: 'El almacén es gastado / de la mi sabiduría' (ll. 1331-1332), and closes with the remark that the marqués has left them all 'en el golfo de la Fortuna' (l. 1340). The most significant metaphor occurs when Fe, the first of the Virtues, speaks on behalf of them all in what must be considered the panegyric of this poem: 'Este fue vn tenplo rico / de nuestra congregación; / en este te certifico / que desde moço bien chico / fezimos abitación' (ll. 501-505). Thus the marqués, because he embodied the three theological and four Stoic or cardinal virtues, becomes the temple or dwelling-place of the 'congregation' of the Virtues. The metaphor of the temple is sustained when Fe laments the breaking of the strongest pillars, alluding to the deaths of the renowned theologians, El Tostado and Alfonso de Cartagena before that of the marqués. Here the metaphor seems inconsistent, since originally Santillana is referred to as the temple but now as one of its pillars. Prudencia in her lament uses the temple image in a simile when she says, 'quedo / como tenplo sin columna' (ll. 634-635) and it is taken up again in a metaphor in the final stanza of the poet's reply to the Virtues. Rather than grieving for the man who has died, the focus is now on Castile's loss of his exceptional qualities and the negative consequences that are

bound to ensue: ‘que quando la gran coluna / quiebra, sin dubda ninguna / se quiere caer el templo’ (ll. 1233-1235).

Conclusion

Both the *Defunción* and the *Planto* were written in the late 1450s and both were written on the occasion of the death of a member of Gómez Manrique’s extended family, but his approach to these two tasks is radically different. The *Defunción* contains the four elements that constitute the traditional medieval *planctus* but it also contains a certain amount of vivid narrative illustrating the effect Garcilaso’s death has on his fellow knights and above all on his family. As a frequent advocate of the Stoic virtues, it is hardly surprising that Gómez Manrique’s consolatory stanzas urge the family to bear their loss with fortitude. There is irony in the fact that it is the mother of the deceased who has to deliver this message, but it also places the focus of the poem firmly on the loss suffered by the family.

The *Planto* for Santillana fulfils a very different function. Garcilaso, although knighted, was still a young man, whereas Santillana had distinguished himself nationally both as a soldier and a literary man. The use of an allegorical framework for the poem is a departure from the *planctus*, although three of the traditional components are included: the announcement of the death, the expression of grief and the panegyric. The lack of consolatory material is noticeable and from stanza CXXII there is a shift of emphasis from the mere expression of sorrow to the repercussions that Santillana’s death will have on the nation. The poem ends on a decidedly pessimistic note, suggesting that the marqués has left a turbulent world behind him with insufficient men to guide Castile, thus showing that political concerns can even pervade an elegy.

Chapter III Engaging with Juan de Mena: a Comparison of Three Continuations of the *Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntad* (c.1456-1460)

When Juan de Mena died in 1456 he left uncompleted the *Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntad*. Mena wrote 106 stanzas in which he set out the framework for the poem: a dialogue between Razón and Voluntad in which Voluntad is represented by the seven deadly sins and at the end of which Prudencia will be called upon to pass judgement. He only lived to compose exchanges between Razón and four of the sins: Pride, Avarice, Lust and Anger, but the incomplete poem attracted three continuations. One of these is by Pero Guillén de Segovia, a member of the Carrillo circle, discussed in chapter IV, who also responded to two of Gómez Manrique's poems. Another is by Gómez Manrique. The third is by Jerónimo de Olivares who also took it upon himself not only to make some stylistic alterations to Mena's verses, but in addition, to insert no fewer than forty-two extra stanzas as glosses to the text. As will become clear in the discussion of Olivares, the continuations by Guillén de Segovia and Gómez Manrique precede that of Olivares. The existence of these works provides an opportunity to compare Gómez Manrique's approach to the task of completing Mena's poem with that of his contemporaries. I will first summarize the content of Mena's poem before commenting first on the continuation by Pero Guillén de Segovia and then on Gómez Manrique's. Thereafter I will discuss Olivares's prologue, the corrections he made to Mena's text, his glosses and continuation. The earliest witness of Olivares's work that I have seen is contained in the 1505 Cromberger edition of Mena's complete works. All quotations from Olivares refer to this text which I have edited.

Juan de Mena's Unfinished Poem

The topic that Mena had chosen for his last poem was one that had a long tradition behind it. Both María Rosa de Lida Malkiel and Gladys Rivera suggest that the original inspiration for the theme of the seven deadly sins might be found as long ago as the fourth century AD in Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, which tells of a battle between the personified Virtues and Sins (Lida de Malkiel 1984: 112; Rivera 1982: 14). Mena and the authors of the continuations may have been acquainted with this work or perhaps knew in some form Dante's *Divine Comedy* which also uses the category of the seven deadly sins. They might also have read two works on a similar theme that were produced in fourteenth-century Spain: Juan Ruiz's *Libro de Buen Amor* and Pero López de Ayala's *Rimado de Palacio*. The former contains a section on eight sins each of

which is followed by an *exemplum* (Ruiz 1988: 151-170). The latter contains a section devoted to the Ten Commandments, in which López de Ayala lists seven deadly sins, commenting on their characteristics and the harm that they cause (López de Ayala 2000: 13-23). Writing at the turn of the fifteenth century Francisco Imperial in *El dezir a las syete virtudes* gives the seven Virtues a human form when they are introduced to him by a man he takes to be a poet; the seven sins, however, are represented by serpents. Mena's approach to the topic, as we shall see, takes a very different form from all of these antecedents.

Mena's introductory stanzas have a valedictory tone as he invokes the Christian muse, dismissing the 'musas gentiles' whom he now sees as sirens (Gómez Manrique 2003: 468, l. 9)¹⁶ who had lured him all his life to earthly concerns. He now takes stock of his life, welcoming his mature years as an opportunity to set his house in order: 'Venid, lisongeras canas, / que tardáys demasiado; / tirad presunções vanas / al tienpo tan malgastado' (ll. 17-20). He compares human life to an old house that is falling into disrepair and goes on to declare, 'La vida pasada es parte / de la muerte aduenidera' (ll. 33-34). He resolves to focus his efforts in a more serious direction, a decision that will affect the nature of his poetry in future: 'Vsemos de los poemas / tomando d'ellos lo bueno, / mas fuyan de nuestro seno / las sus fabulosas temas' (ll. 105-108). In other words, he intends to reduce the frequency of his allusions to classical fables, a feature of his earlier work. A few lines further on he commits himself to following 'la cathólica vía' in his future writing (l. 125) before explaining the structure he intends giving to this new work: a debate between Razón and Voluntad at the end of which Prudencia will judge who is the winner.

A description of the seven-headed monster, Voluntad, follows, each one of her faces indicative of the sin that is represented. Mena chose to present Voluntad as a hideous creature 'de siete caras y bocas, / todas feas, si no en pocas, / desonesta fermosura' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 474, ll. 150-152), the seven faces each representing one of the seven deadly sins. Razón, however, is presented as a very different being: 'La su relumbrante cara / y su gesto cristalino / reparten lunbre muy clara / por todo el ayre vezino' (ll. 241-244). There appears to be no traditional order in the discussion of the seven sins: Dante, for example, treats that of Lust first and leaves Pride until last.

Mena chooses Soberuia to be the first sin upbraided by Razón who opens the debate, claiming that pride is the greatest of human evils and leads to perdition.

¹⁶ All quotations from Mena's poem refer to the text given in Vidal González's 2003 edition of Gómez Manrique's complete works which is based on the manuscript MP3.

Voluntad is allowed one stanza in which she makes a five-point response in self-defence on the grounds of her knowledge, beauty, riches, lineage and religious observance (ll. 273-280). Razón replies to each of these claims, beginning by stating that the wise do not parade their knowledge; instead, in true Senecan fashion she suggests that real wisdom lies in practising moderation: ‘Sea tu fundamento / en saberte moderar’ (ll. 285-286). Physical beauty is a gift that does not last and wealth is something that we cannot take with us when we die. On the subject of noble lineage Razón objects to the ‘leyes de gentileza’ (l. 362) that sustain the belief that a coat of arms and an ancient lineage are proof of nobility. For Razón nobility is a moral concept: ‘Es contrato que te obliga / a ser bueno de derecho’ (ll. 371-372). The onus remains with the individual who must behave in such a way as to merit being considered noble: ‘y la virtud se contrasta / que por el linage cobras, / si non responden tus obras / a la tu tan buena casta’ (ll. 381-384). Soberuia’s claim to piety is rejected as religious hypocrisy motivated by the desire to draw attention to herself, as Razón states, ‘Quien finge la seruidunbre / de soberuiosa omildat, / no busca la claridat, / mas quiere buscar la lunbre’ (ll. 461-464).

Auariçia is then asked by Razón why she persists in hoarding her ill-gotten gains since she derives no benefit from them. Like Souerbia, she also gives five reasons to defend her position: not only is she providing for her old age and for possible reversals of fortune, but she enjoys the prestige that wealth brings, the ability to exact vengeance, and to lend money if it will be advantageous to her. Razón, however, disagrees on all five counts. She sees little point in accumulating wealth for the end of one’s life and, using the nautical metaphor of a well-provisioned ship, she declares, ‘con tanto lastre tu barca / çiará quando la remes’ (ll. 503-504). Furthermore, material wealth does not necessarily ensure peace and security since Fortune is capable of bringing disaster to the rich: ‘Seguras del su conbate / son las casas pobrezillas, / los palacios y las sillas / de los ricos más abate’ (ll. 513-516). Moreover, wealth causes strife in families and attracts others who will covet her riches. On the subject of taking vengeance Razón assures Auariçia that this is much easier when you have nothing to lose. Perhaps what is most pertinent in the attack Razón launches against the miser is that she denounces the practice of usury and the cruelty of lending money at an extortionately high rate of interest: ‘ca si das veynte por çiento / ya tu dádiva se viçia’ (ll. 555-556).

Luxuria occupies a higher profile than the two sins already treated since Mena devotes eight stanzas to Razón’s condemnation of her: ‘¡O Luxuria, vil foguera, / de

sufre mucho fedionda, / en todo tienpo cachonda / sin razón e sin manera!’ (ll. 625-628). She is the enemy of chastity, demeans people of high estate, brings only short-lived pleasure but causes lengthy regrets, strife between married couples, and feuds amongst relatives. Moreover, Luxuria has a debilitating effect on human beings: ‘los sentidos disminuyes / e los ingenios ofuscas’ (ll. 677-678) and Mena uses antithesis again to make his point when he says, ‘do el vençedor es vençido / y el cobrar es perdimiento’ (ll. 639-640). Illegitimacy, a consequence of female weakness, means that ‘por culpa de las madres / muchos fijos a sus padres / saluden por estrangeros’ (ll. 670-672). Luxuria, however, is able to make a vigorous response to Razón’s criticisms, reminding her that God endowed man and the animal kingdom with the pleasure that is derived from the sexual act. Because of this, not only is the natural world preserved, but the human race has gone forth and multiplied, this being particularly important in times of war, disease and natural disaster. While conceding that some of her acts are harmful, Luxuria appeals to Razón not to portray her in such a negative light as, on balance, she does more good than harm. In keeping with her opinion that Mena’s last work was ‘un retroceso en la dirección renacentista’ (Lida de Malkiel 1984: 110), Lida de Malkiel asserts that Razón’s unreasonable response to Luxuria reflects ‘los elementos medievales, muy marcados en esta obra [...] en la línea del ascetismo cristiano’ (114) when comparing it with the *Laberinto de fortuna*. She considers Luxuria’s defence ‘como arma de la naturaleza contra la muerte, expuesta más de siglo y medio antes en el *Roman de la Rose* de Jean de Meung’ (114). What is striking about this exchange is that Luxuria appears to be represented as gaining the upper hand in the debate; it is significant that in Mena’s poem she has the last word in this exchange with Razón who is dismissed and described as ‘fatigada y perseguida’ (Gómez Manrique 2002: l. 739).

The last of the sins that Mena writes about in his unfinished poem is Yra, and it is significant that in this dialogue it is she who initiates the debate with Razón who is still exhausted after her verbal tussle with Luxuria. Yra maintains that to avenge herself she does not need all the conventional trappings of war, described in picturesque terms in stanza XCV, because ‘sólo corazón y manos / me conviene demostrar’ (ll. 767-768). The impatient and aggressive tone of her speech is maintained in stanza XCVII: ‘Nyn atiende la liçençia / del ronco son de la tronpa / o la batalla que ronpa / porque incline mi paçiençia’ (ll. 769-772) and she dismisses any conciliatory measures or truce (ll. 775-776). Her final self-justificatory argument is that a man’s honour cannot be satisfied by reason if no amends are made after receiving an insult (ll. 789-792). In her Stoically temperate reply Razón points to the negative effects of rage: it impairs the judgement

and only plays into the enemy's hands (ll. 801-808). Razón urges Yra to allow those in high places to pass judgement in disputes because, she says, 'el justo corazón / afeciones y pasión / todo deue desechar' (ll. 822-824). Furthermore, Razón warns Yra that she must not attack those who respect religion or who are involved with the rites of the church. She asks finally how God can forgive anyone their sins if they themselves cannot forgive others. It is at this point that Mena's original part of the poem ends, Yra and Razón having spoken an equal number of stanzas.

Guillén de Segovia's Continuation

Pero Guillén de Segovia's continuation consists of seventy stanzas. The first five extend Razón's rejection of Yra's self-defence in the last completed section of Mena's poem, perhaps because Pero Guillén thought that Mena had intended to develop this section further. Razón maintains that Yra is unable to make rational judgements and her crimes are such that she becomes 'de malicia vezyno' (Guillén de Segovia 1989: 243, l. 14), even more so than when someone is drunk. As a result of this she is unable to accept criticism in a positive spirit, but instead, Razón says, 'figura tu fantasía / beneficio por baldón / [...] / que no tomas ni recibes / del amigo correpción' (ll. 19-20 & 23-24). Razón concludes this section with the thought that an angry reaction achieves nothing and only ensures that the enemy will not yield an inch: 'Ca quien con yra se venga / en este grado que digo / de (sic)¹⁷ cabsa quel enemigo / en lo suyo se mantenga' (ll. 33-36).

Razón next turns to Gula and asks why she persists in her habits, urging her to consider the physical consequences of her overindulgence. Gula's reply of four stanzas begins with her declaration that like Eve, she was born in paradise, and has no intention of curbing her inclinations, just as Eve picked the longed-for forbidden fruit. In the second and third stanzas she argues from the first person plural, on behalf of all mankind: all creatures need to eat. Reflecting on the cycle of life and death, she reminds Razón that as humans, we eat food and, when we die, the worms eat us; that it is by eating that the cycle of life is perpetuated. Razón replies that there is a difference between eating to live and living to eat. She does not develop the allusion made by Gula to Eve having been born in paradise, but places much emphasis on the evils of drunkenness: 'tú fundaste con torpeza / bodegones y tavernas, / tú mantienes y gobiernas / muchos viles en vileza' (ll. 108-111). She concludes her attack on Gula by

¹⁷ 'da cabsa ...' would make better sense here.

accusing her of profligacy with worldly goods and of being the cause of much suffering and strife.

Razón portrays Envidia as constantly dissatisfied with her lot, citing Cain's murderous jealousy of Abel, and Caesar's bitter rivalry with Pompey. She claims that Envidia is the sin that causes greatest harm to the human race, that her conscience is corrupt and she has no concerns for the salvation of her soul. Moreover, Envidia is never at peace with herself. Razón demands to know why she covets what others have, declaring that she, Razón, has no similar aspirations: 'que sy tú muchos posees / a mí no me pesa dello, / nin de mí nunca querello, / en tal caso si me crees' (ll. 204-207). Envidia's reply is a straightforward statement of her ambition to rise above others in society, not only to be rich, but to be knowledgeable and held in high esteem. She continues her defence by declaring that, 'Para en esto nos conviene / acatar en las planetas / las estrellas y cometas / y lo quel cielo contiene. / Sy su orden todo tiene / segund lo permite Dios, / no podemos privar nos / lo que de arriba nos viene' (ll. 248-255). In other words, she is claiming that God made the world this way and she, Envidia, is part of it: 'do la culpa non es mía, / no devo ser retratada' (ll. 270-271). Razón's response to this argument is brief, rebutting the idea that envy is an inevitable and pre-ordained part of life: we are born with free will and should strive to use it to overcome our faults and seek to be virtuous if we want to avoid damnation (ll. 284-293).

Pereza is condemned by Razón in a long list of faults that take up seven stanzas. She is guilty of careless thinking, the cause of poverty and suffering, sleeps too much, keeps a dirty house, fails to look after the resources she has, and brings up her children badly. She neglects her religious obligations and is not held back by fear or moved by compassion. If she does not commit certain sins, such as the use of cosmetics, it is not due to any virtue, but to slovenliness: 'Sy no te bruñes y afeytas / no depende de virtud' (ll. 351-352). She has no real come back on this particular argument and she defends herself feebly by asserting, 'Fija so de continencia' (l. 360), passing her sloth off as temperance. Moreover, she claims to be devoid of other sins such as malice, covetousness and vainglory. She is not interested in reading, partly because she dislikes seeing criticism of herself, and shies away from mental exercise, having no wish to be considered wise and does not possess a competitive spirit. Her intellectual laziness is emphasized by her statement, 'largo proceso aborrezco / de sofismadas razones, / deseo las conclusyones / lo superfluo denegando' (ll. 378-381). She denies that her inactivity brings financial hardship since fortune treats us with complete indifference to our

efforts: ‘pues fortuna nos contrasta / o ayuda segund obra / diligencia no lo cobra / nin pereza lo desgasta’ (ll. 388-391). She rejects the idea that by free will we can influence our fortunes since ‘todo depende de en cima / lo futuro y lo presente’ (ll. 398-399). She is satisfied with her lot and does not covet the good fortune of others. Razón urges Pereza to rouse herself and rejects these arguments on the grounds that her apathy is inexcusable and that she is trying to make a virtue out of vice: ‘non es acto que se enmiende / la perversa consuetud / nin es perfecta virtud / la que del vicio depende’ (ll. 420-423). Pereza, having also received an exhortation to confess her sin, admits defeat.

Pero Guillén’s conclusion in the final fourteen stanzas ignores Mena’s promise in stanza XVIII of his poem (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 137-144) that Prudencia would make a final judgement, and opts to end on a more personal note. After Pereza concedes victory to Razón (Guillén de Segovia 1989: ll. 444-447), the rubric reads, ‘Prosigue y narra el actor segund el principio’ and in the following five stanzas, reminiscent of Mena’s verses prefaced by the heading ‘Castiga el tienpo malgastado’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 470), Pero Guillén takes the opportunity to show off his acquaintance with classical mythology while at the same time rejecting, as Mena had done in lines 193-197 of his poem, the inspiration that it had given him in the past. Instead, he decides to seek salvation by adhering to the Christian faith which involves following Razón rather than Voluntad. He echoes the words of James 2, 14-26, affirming his belief that to achieve eternal life it is necessary to do good works: ‘buenas obras son los remos / en esta fonda laguna’ (Guillén de Segovia 1989: 256, ll. 498-499). The urgent need for action and the fleeting nature of human life are emphasized: ‘Nuestra vida es ninguna / por su corroptible masa / mucho más presto se pasa / que la sonbra de la luna’ (ll. 500-503). We should make amends for wrongdoing before death overtakes us, shun all excesses of the material world and think only of ‘la gloria duradera’ (l. 539). His final two stanzas are devoted to Juan de Mena who, having begun this work, especially deserves our prayers.

Gómez Manrique’s Continuation

Gómez Manrique’s continuation is much longer and more detailed than Pero Guillén’s, consisting of 158 stanzas (Gómez Manrique 2003: 501-552). He starts with a short introduction of his own in which he reflects on how death is a great leveller, treating people of all estates equally. He offers the obligatory declaration of modesty, claiming that his skills as a poet are inferior to Mena’s. Like Mena, he also rejects the Muses as his inspiration, invoking instead ‘la santa graçia divina’ (l. 878) but, unlike

Mena, he uses a number of biblical references from both the New and Old Testaments on both sides of the debate. He also gives *Voluntad* a significant role in the three dialogues that Mena was unable to write.

Unlike Pero Guillén, Gómez Manrique assumed that Mena had completed the dialogue between *Razón* and *Yra* and, after his introduction, embarks on a dialogue between *Gula* and *Razón*. *Gula* speaks first, beginning her defence by saying that all people need to eat, and to eat well is to look after one's health. To support this argument further *Gula* quotes Christ's words from Matthew's gospel (15, 11), 'Non lo qu'entra por la boca, / según dize San Mateos, / faze de los justos reos, / que lo que sale los troca' (ll. 913-916). This quotation is deliberately taken out of context: Christ was addressing the Pharisees, taking them to task for publicly adhering strictly to certain laws while failing to examine their consciences. In the same stanza *Gula* self-righteously refers to the folly of those who think they may achieve salvation by fasting while at the same time 'mintiendo e disfamando' (l. 919). She proceeds in the following verse to quote Christ's famous saying that man cannot live on bread alone (Luke, 4, 4), again twisting its meaning so that it becomes an invitation to overindulgence. She completes her defence by maintaining that it is a greater folly to spend money on clothing than on food.

Razón opens her response to *Gula* by telling her that she is the enemy of both the young and the old, although it is necessary to eat in order to live: 'tú biues por comer / e comes para morir' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 947-948). Moreover, she counters *Gula*'s misuse of biblical references with three examples from the Old Testament of acts of greed that were punished or threatened with punishment: Jonathan broke his fast (I Samuel, 14, 24-25) and nearly paid the ultimate price, whilst Adam ate the fruit offered him by Eve (Genesis, 3), causing them both to be condemned 'a tenebrosa prisión' (Gómez Manrique 2003: l. 974) and Lot's drunkenness caused him to father two sons incestuously, one with each daughter (Genesis, 19, 30-38). *Razón* then returns to the second claim that *Gula* had made, that man cannot live on bread alone, insisting on the metaphorical sense intended by Christ: 'no cuydes dezirlo, no, / por beuir sin golosinas; / más sin palabras diuinas / que con el pan conparó' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 997-1000). Finally *Razón* accuses *Gula* of being at the root of the other sins (with the exception of *Envidia*) and adds that she is the particular the enemy of those following a military or ecclesiastical career. *Gula* is allowed only one stanza to respond, and *Razón* has the last word, praising the Stoic virtue of moderation and the avoidance of excess: 'que lo superfluo dexemos' (l. 1080).

Razón speaks first when she meets Envidia, declaring that what distinguishes her from the other sins is the total lack of pleasure that she derives from anything. Envidia's reply is one of the more interesting of the defences in this work. Firstly, while all human beings are ostensibly of the same origin, there is such a discrepancy in the way nature and fortune distribute their gifts that she can only feel aggrieved not to have been so highly favoured as others she sees around her; secondly, those gifts that she does possess are not valued by others. Her third attempt at self-justification is that men can look back enviously to the past and emulate examples of bravery, whilst envy of the valiant will encourage the more fearful to act bravely. Envy of honours gained will inspire others to earn similar rewards, and in the same way the desire to work competitively will ennoble people (l. 1145-1152). Envidia sees virtue in such aspirations which, she claims, are founded 'sobre peña de nobleza' (l. 1158) and should be regarded as virtuous rather than sinful. This suggestion is perhaps the most thought-provoking of the debate since Envidia is expressing the idea that aspiration to fame is something to be praised rather than rejected as sinful. In fact, in the gloss of his own poem written for his sister, 'La péñola tengo con tinta en la mano', Gómez Manrique praises Caesar, whose example he cites in this passage, for the ambition that he displayed in wanting to equal Alexander the Great, describing his reaction at the sight of the hero's statue: 'dio vn gran gemido, como quexándose de la perezosa haraganía suya porque en la edat que en la sazón era él, ya Alixandre el mundo avía enseñoreado' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 433-434, ll. 271-287).

Razón, of course, rejects all these arguments. Although we are all born and die as equals, we are not all equal during our lifetime. Neither are we all endowed with the same natural gifts, but should make the most of those we have received. Even the recipients of great natural powers must still strive to lead a virtuous life in order to achieve salvation; the great talents of men such as Sampson and Orpheus did not mean that they were perfect, 'ca esta sola consiste / en virtud, si la seguiste / procurando saluación (517, ll. 1214-1216). Those who are blessed with material wealth cannot take it with them to the next world when they die and the wise man therefore neither takes pleasure in his wealth nor frets at its loss. Where earthly honours are concerned Gómez Manrique emphasizes that these are not easily won, and are in any case are ephemeral. It is important to value lasting, spiritual goods rather than temporal ones. With this in mind, he makes Razón say, 'más presto pasan, amigo, / que flores de las mañanas, / todas son cosas liuianas, / por tienpo pereçederas, / pues busca las duraderas, / dexando las glorias vanas' (ll. 1275-1280). Heroism in battle is less admirable than, for example,

Saint Martin's act of cutting his cloak in half to share it with a poor man, a deed that guaranteed him eternal salvation. Razón rejects the glory of honours received in war, reminding Envidia of all the death, destruction and misfortunes that result from armed conflict. She also recalls the rivalry between the brothers Cain and Abel and between Caesar and Pompey, examples also given by Pero Guillén, and then expresses the opinion that it is actually because of envy that wars break out, citing a topical example: 'por esta son ençendidas / en Castilla grandes flamas' (ll. 1333-1334).

The last of the sins to confront Razón is Pereza who, true to her nature, is reluctant to enter into any debate with Razón on the grounds that she would rather rest. She does not believe that temporal honours and goods, the subject of the previous debate with Envidia, are achieved through work; all the diligent achieve is to work themselves to death. Her defence only amounts to two stanzas, no doubt a deliberate decision on Gómez Manrique's part to give a portrayal of this vice that emphasizes her indolence. Razón launches into a vigorous attack on Pereza, firstly for being too lazy to defend herself and then for failing to heed either the material or the spiritual consequences of her idleness, saying that material rewards may be gained by those who help themselves: 'mas ayudarse conuiene / para ser reçibidor' (ll. 1399-1400). Since, however, worldly goods and honours are not considered to be of lasting value, Razón qualifies this statement by suggesting that Pereza should model herself on Fabriçio (l. 1402), who may have been Gaius Fabricius Lucindus (524n) and who expelled a colleague from the Senate on the grounds that he satisfied his taste for luxury excessively. Instead, Pereza should rouse herself into activity if she wishes to achieve eternal life by following the path that Christ trod. To emphasize this point Razón uses two similes to underline the impossibility of saving one's soul without making the necessary effort: 'es difiçil de fazer, / como syn senbrar cojer, / e sin letras ser letrado' (ll. 1423-1424).

Pereza retorts that you only have to look to contemporary Castile, full of 'ricos y muy prosperados, / sin orden, por açidente' (ll. 1431-1432), to see how the efforts of the deserving are wasted, a comment that may well reflect the views of Gómez Manrique. She sees many striving in vain to win the honours that are awarded to others who make no effort, citing the example of Trajan, a Spaniard by birth, who she claims was elected emperor without any effort on his part. In addition Pereza proceeds to quote examples from the New Testament, casting doubt on the salvation of sinners who are supposedly forgiven their past misdeeds without exerting themselves and performing good works. First she refers to the robber, Dimas, who was crucified next to Christ and who achieved

salvation with no effort but merely ‘con solo memento mei / que dixo con contrición’ (ll. 1463-1464), according to Luke’s gospel (23, 42). Secondly she cites Mary Magdalene who did not find instant forgiveness (Luke, 8, 2) and thirdly the woman from Canaan whom Jesus himself rebukes initially when she requested that he heal her daughter (Matthew, 15, 21-28).¹⁸

Razón rejects all these arguments outright as evil and ill-founded, accusing Pereza of causing many to take the road to perdition by listening to them. She replies to all of them except one. On the subject of worldly honours, she declares that Trajan was worthy of his election to high office and there is a suggestion of divine intervention when she says, ‘no fue, no, por dormitorio / de los romanos eleito, / mas por diuino secreto, / seyendo mereçedor (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 1517-1520). She offers further examples of great men from the past who would not be remembered had they not exerted themselves, such as Hannibal, who would never have been able to cross mountains and swamps had he never made the effort to do so, as well as many famous heroes of ancient Rome.

Where material wealth is concerned Razón assures Pereza that the idle rarely prosper and only acquire riches if they inherit them; moreover, many idlers lose what their parents have gained by dint of hard work. She admits that Fortune has a hand in distributing riches, but is seldom supportive of idleness: ‘que maguer Fortuna, quando / le plaze, dé la riqueza, / pocas vezes la pereza / la fallará de su vando’ (ll. 1573-1576). If Pereza wishes to prosper she must be diligent.

When discussing salvation Razón remarks that if Pereza cannot even rouse herself to strive after worldly fame and wealth, she is still less likely to achieve eternal life, something that was only made possible by Christ’s incarnation and his passion. The human race is born with free will to make the choice between taking the narrow path leading to eternity or to lose all hope of salvation by following ‘tras la bestial afección’ (l. 1616). Razón then also refers to the New Testament, warning that even though the faithful make the right choice, the way is still full of dangers. Here she echoes the words of ‘el apóstol [...] / por su epístola segunda’ (ll. 1626-1627), an allusion perhaps to the second epistle of Peter in which people are exhorted to practise virtue of all kinds, and by so doing can expect to be rewarded; ‘For so an entrance shall be ministered unto to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ’ (2, Peter, 1, 11). Razón then reminds Pereza of the need for prayer with a reference to

¹⁸ These two *exempla* are less obvious than the first since, unlike the robber who was crucified for theft, the gospels tell us nothing about Mary Magdalene’s or the Canaanite woman’s previous misdeeds.

Christ's words in the garden of Gethsemane: 'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak' (Matthew, 26, 41; Mark, 14, 38).

Razón then questions Pereza's use of biblical references to justify her stance. On the subject of Dimas, she contends that he achieved salvation not just because of his faith, but through his actions: 'Que sy Dimas saluo fue / por la fe con que creyó, / no menos porque seruió / con San Juan lo prouaré' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 1665-1669). The reason for referring to Saint John is not immediately obvious because it is in Saint Luke's gospel that we are told that one of the criminals crucified at the same time rebukes the other criminal for jeering at Jesus and for suggesting that if he were the son of God he should be able to save all three of them. In fact neither robber is named in the four gospels included in the New Testament, but here Gómez Manrique is alluding to the fourth-century Church Father, Saint John Chrysostom, who refers to the apocryphal gospel of Nicodemus in which this robber is named and his sayings reported, as Jean Joseph Gaume pointed out (Gaume 1882: 25). According to Gaume, a tradition grew up regarding Dimas who was reputed to have been in the habit of robbing travellers in the desert. Legend has it that he was on the point of robbing the Holy Family on their flight into Egypt when, becoming aware of the divine nature of the Christ child, he refrained from stealing from them but instead offered them shelter for the night in a cave (17). Luke's version of the crucifixion has Dimas declare, 'We receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss' (Luke, 23, 41). Another version of the story of Dimas's salvation is found in the final lines of the thirteenth-century *Libre dels tres reys d'orient* (Alvar, ed. 1965: ll. 225-242). On the strength of this story of Dimas's good deed, Razón then stresses the need to perform good works as well as to have faith in order to achieve salvation, citing James's epistle (2, 14-26) when she says, 'que syn las obras la fe / es como casa syn puerta' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 535, ll. 1669-1670). As for Pereza's reference to Mary Magdalene, Razón dismisses it, warning her that she should not think that she can save herself by showing sudden contrition on her deathbed. By so doing, she says, citing a 'vulgar ensyenplo' referred to in the rubric which precedes this stanza, 'por ventura lançarás / la sogá tras la herrada' (ll. 1679-1680). Interestingly, Razón does not respond to Pereza's final New Testament reference, that of the Canaanite woman.

A new section of the poem commences with the appearance in line 1689 of Prudencia who, as Mena had intended, is to pass judgement on the debate between Razón and Voluntad. She finds in favour of Razón, condemning Voluntad on the grounds that she is lacking in the four cardinal virtues (prudence, justice, temperance

and fortitude) and the three theological virtues (faith, hope and charity). Prudencia points out that Voluntad's preoccupations are with temporal things 'lo qual pasa como un sueño / e como sonbra falleçe' (ll. 1759-1760). Those who follow this way of life are mad since even the pleasures that last longest in this world will fade: 'se podreçe tan aýna / como mançana madura' (ll. 1767-1768). At this point in her judgement Prudencia begins to address all men rather than Voluntad, saying that man, being a rational creature, should be able to follow Razón and distance himself from 'los brutos animales' (ll. 1777-1780). She advises all men to follow the virtuous 'avunque d'estos muchos menos / que de malos fallarás' (ll. 1787-1788). To achieve everlasting life, man must follow the 'camino trabajoso' (l. 1800), although it is a narrow one.

Prudencia then goes on to suggest a remedy for each individual sin by the exercise of Christian and Stoic virtues. Glossing the words of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew, 5, 3), she declares: 'Que los vmildes serán / en los çielos ensalzados, / los soberbios derribados / a do siempre penarán' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 1809-1812). The avaricious are reminded that it is not possible to take their worldly goods to the next life, whilst the lustful are told to rein in their desires with a warning to men to think not of the pleasure that is derived from this sin but to think 'después de pasado / cuánto dexa desplacer' (ll. 1847-8). There is an additional warning for women who, unlike men, need to consider their reputations: 'más deurían las mugeres / esquivar las tentaçiones [...] por que no sus claras famas / disputen por los ryncones' (ll. 1851-1852 & 1855-1856). The wrathful are reminded that justice cannot be carried out when a person is swayed by anger. The gluttonous are urged to embrace yet another Stoic virtue, that of temperance, while the envious are advised that Christian love will be a defence against the 'dardos envidiosos' (l. 1898) they suffer, and will instead lead them to heaven. Lastly, having urged the slothful to stir themselves into action, Prudencia then makes clear that salvation is not just a matter of avoiding sin, but also requires good to be done: 'quien la gloria quisiere, / el bien faga que podrá' (ll. 1927-1928), advice that Pereza has already received from Razón.

In stanza CCXLVIII a mixture of Christian and Senecan influences continues to be seen in the utterances of Prudencia when she insists on the importance of good works. Her words 'qu'en el punto que naçéys / comienza vuestro morir' (ll. 1983-1984) echo those of Mena in the fifth stanza of the original poem as well as those of Seneca when he wrote to Marcia to console her on the death of her son: 'mors enim illi denuntiata nascenti est; in hanc legem erat satus, hoc illum fatum ab utero statim prosequatur' (Seneca 1932: vol. 2, 30). Mena and Gómez Manrique appear to have

been happy to take from Seneca those maxims that supported their own ideas and Christian teaching, probably having access to one of the compilations of sayings, many of them Senecan, that are described by Karl Blüher (Blüher 1983: 156-158).¹⁹

Gómez Manrique concludes this work with an address of several stanzas by Prudencia to each of the three estates of man (Gómez Manrique 2003: 548-551, ll. 1993-2088). Clerics are reminded that they need to set a good example by carrying out their duties and adhering to their vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Monarchs and aristocrats are urged to strive for peace and justice and treat the poor and afflicted with compassion, a message that Gómez Manrique also delivered to Fernando and Isabel in his *Regimiento de príncipes*. There is also a warning to the knights of the realm that they should not behave in tyrannical fashion, but treat their vassals well and at the same time accept the sovereignty of the king. The message to the third estate is that they should pay their dues and live by their labours. In the advice to them, ‘dexad las armas e leyes / a fydalgos e doctores’ (ll. 2087-2088) Gómez Manrique decries social ambitions: men should accept the status into which they were born. The final three stanzas are addressed to all men and are a reminder that we will all have to face a final judgement and that charity matters above all else: ‘amarés vn solo Dios, / e como queredes vos / ser amados de verdat, / a los próximos amad’ (ll. 2111-2114).

Jerónimo de Olivares’s Prologue to his Glosses and Continuation

If Gómez Manrique’s 158 stanzas of continuation seem a hard act to follow, the approach taken by Jerónimo de Olivares, a knight of the order of Alcántara about whom little is known, shows that there was still room to go one better. Not only does he write his own continuation of 55 stanzas but, unhappy with the state of Mena’s text, he also undertakes to improve it, going far beyond mere poetico-editorial intervention to expand it, intercalating a further 42 stanzas of his own within the 106 of the original text. These glosses survive in several sixteenth-century editions of Juan de Mena’s complete works with an introductory prose prologue by Olivares, followed by Mena’s text which incorporates the additions made by Olivares.²⁰

In his prologue Olivares reveals that he knows that both Gómez Manrique and Pero Guillén had also produced continuations of the poem. He is respectful towards them both, albeit a little ambiguous towards Gómez Manrique, acknowledging that with

¹⁹ Later in the same work Seneca declares that death is not to be feared as it is a release from the sufferings of this world: ‘Mors dolorum omnium exsolutio est et finis, ultra quem mala nostra non exeunt’ (66), an idea that is contrary to the teaching of the Catholic church.

²⁰ Since there is no modern edition of his glosses and continuation, I provide an edition of them in the Appendix.

his many duties and responsibilities, he did not have ‘aquel reposo que para ello convenía’ (Appendix: 211), but making no criticism of his work. He then admits to having seen ‘otro fin por vn Pero Guillén gran trovador (a mi ver)’ (211), but since he cannot put into words quite why this version is not satisfactory he often considers writing ‘vn tercero fin’ (211).

Olivares tells us that while he was debating with himself as to whether he should finish Mena’s work, he received a visitation from a spirit declaring himself to be Juan de Mena, granted brief leave of absence from purgatory. Intriguingly, the ghostly visitor tells him that when he was alive he had discussed his poem with Olivares’s father who had had an interesting comment to make about the content of the work: ‘Que pues que yo metía en campo para batallar la Razón e la Voluntad, que mirasse quan injusto era meter en la liça, la vna muy acompañada de coplas, e la otra casi sola’ (212). Mena’s ghost then tells how he had reacted positively to this observation, and had already started the revision, writing more stanzas for Yra’s argument than he had originally envisaged. Since death had surprised him suddenly, the still unbalanced sections on the vices he had written on remained in their unexpanded state: ‘Yo teniéndole en merced la tal corrección e aviso, propuse emendarlo como después hize, quando del vicio dela yra traté’ (212). He subsequently entreats Olivares to carry on the work of expansion to encompass Soberuia, Avariçia and Luxuria so that they all speak the same number of verses as Razón (212). If Mena and Olivares senior were indeed acquainted with each other, perhaps the idea of allowing the seven personified sins to defend themselves more fully, as they do in Olivares’s version, was not originally part of Mena’s plan. Whether Olivares is just telling tall stories about his father or really was party to Mena’s last thoughts on the poem, he grants himself carte blanche to amend it as he sees fit. Lida de Malkiel considers the anecdote about Mena’s ghost to be a ploy ‘para vencer los escúpulos de modestia de Olivares’ (Lida de Malkiel 1984: 402).

Mena’s ghost also confesses that he had still to attend to tidy up rhyme scheme when he died, saying, ‘el estilo de consonar, que en quinze partes quedó herrado, limar no pude como la arte pedía’ (Appendix: 212). In fact a close reading of the text shows that Olivares made fifteen alterations to Mena’s poem, all of them regularizing the rhyme scheme of ABBAACCA established by Mena, although the 1505 edition indicates only eleven of these changes and that of 1552 seven. In some cases Olivares merely has to reverse the order of two lines: stanza VI of MP3, for instance, reads, ‘La vida pasada es parte / de la muerte aduenidera’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 33-34), whereas Olivares gives the correct, ‘De la muerte aduenidera / la vida passada es parte’

(Appendix: ll. 41-42). In other cases the wording is changed slightly, again to maintain the rhyme scheme. For example, stanza XXIX in MP3 has ‘Como el sol claro relunbra / quando las nuves desecha’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 225-226), but Olivares alters this effectively to ‘Como el sol claro desecha / las nuves quando relumbra’ (Appendix: ll. 225-226).

Olivares’s Glosses

Olivares goes far beyond this kind of poetico-editorial intervention to bulk out Mena’s text with intercalations between stanzas. These glosses, all *octavas* using the same rhyme scheme, are without exception created to expand the role of Voluntad in the debate, reflecting the criticism expressed by the ghostly Mena regarding his injustice in having allotted so many more *coplas* to Razón than to Voluntad. Mena’s poem gives only one stanza to Soberuia and twenty-five to Razón and so, to put things right, Olivares inserts twenty-four stanzas, interspersed at appropriate intervals, to create a more balanced dialogue in which Voluntad has the opportunity to respond to Razón’s accusations and defend herself on the five points she raises in Mena’s poem about wisdom, beauty, wealth, nobility and piety (Appendix: ll. 281-288).²¹ On the subject of her superior knowledge Soberuia claims that this can only be good and makes a plea for greater recognition of the *letrado* whom she thinks is underrated: ‘No me puedes tú negar / según la razón tenemos / que a los que mucho sabemos / no nos deuan más honrrar’ (ll. 305-308). By according more praise to this class in society their profile will be raised: ‘pues la cosa qu’es loada / cresce con verse loar’ (ll. 311-312).

Where beauty is concerned, Soberuia rejects Razón’s argument that it is not to be valued since it is short-lived, but claims instead that it should be treasured while it lasts: ‘Quando belleza se imprime / hallo que es bien de gozalla, / y no después dessealla / que el deseo me lastime’ (ll. 365-368). On the question of worldly wealth, however, she lamely expresses satisfaction at the material comforts of her life and the prestige that they bring. She is unable to respond to Razón’s question, ‘¿Bienes pueden ser llamados / los que come la carcoma, / o los que la muerte toma / todos por descaminados?’ (ll. 417-424) since she fails to understand that the value of earthly goods is short-lived.

Olivares inserts six stanzas into Soberuia’s defence of the pride she takes in her rank and lineage, something that he must have considered a significant and negative

²¹ In this section on Olivares’s glosses all references to Mena’s poem are from the appendix, using the line references given there. Mena’s stanzas are referred to using the Roman numerals of Vidal González’s edition; Olivares’s intercalated stanzas are highlighted and numbered with Arabic numerals.

feature of contemporary society. Such pride was also reflected in the resentment of the old nobility during the reign of Enrique IV when the recently ennobled were promoted to positions of power and the old aristocracy were passed over. He incorporates these stanzas two at a time (nos. 11-12, 13-14, 15-16) to create a more realistic dialogue on this matter than on the two previous issues raised, portraying Soberuía as an arrogant aristocrat. Razón's response to Soberuía's assertion that she can be proud of her nobility is significant since Razón rejects the concept of nobility as a quality that can be inherited automatically from one's forebears. Soberuía counters by defending the presumption of the noble class in believing that they should be at the forefront of society and can look down on those not of aristocratic origins: 'assí el hombre sin linage / es cerca de nos espuma' (ll. 451-452). In the final couplet of this stanza Olivares delivers an insult to the noble class when he portrays Soberuía as lacking in self-awareness when she declares, 'Si de quién soy no presumo, / ¿de qué quieres que presuma?' (ll. 455-456). In so saying, she reveals that the aristocracy is so blinkered that it can see no further than its ancient lineage as a proof of nobility, which in itself demonstrates an inability to think intelligently. Responding to Razón's rejection of the aristocracy's ingrained attitudes perpetuated by 'las leyes de gentileza', (l. 458) Soberuía insists that the noble class and royalty deserve to be treated according to their own laws on account of their ancestors' past deeds: 'al buen linaje conuiene / que muestre quién es, do viene / con obras de presumpción' (ll. 473-475). She has no understanding of the concept of nobility as an attribute gained through outstanding qualities and achievements; instead she maintains that the nobility should strive at all costs to stay above the level of 'el vulgo rudo y villano' (l. 495), proudly defiant: 'Con esto nos mantenemos / en honrra y cauallería, / y con esta hidalguía / defensamos y ofendemos. (ll. 501-504).

Razón's last dialogue with Soberuía concerns her self-satisfied attitude towards the practice of religion and the good works that she does. At this point Olivares inserts eight consecutive stanzas (ll. 537-600) in which Soberuía, in truly sanctimonious fashion, details all her virtuous features: she is modest, charitable, and not covetous of others' property, nor given to losing her temper. Moreover, she deserves praise for fasting, scourging herself, attending church assiduously, and inspiring devotion in the irreligious, and is therefore confident of her place in heaven. Razón replies that the virtue of performing these good works is negated by Soberuía's boastfulness about such acts, performed for outward show rather than from a genuine desire to do good: 'querriás ser visto bueno / non curando de lo ser; / y avnque quieras bien fazer, / por

buenas obras que fagas, / todas ellas estragas / con el tu ensoberueçer' (ll. 602-608). These lines are followed by an accusation of hypocrisy when Razón exclaims, '¡O doble cara dañosa, / red de sonbra religiosa, / encubierta truhanía!' (ll. 618- 620), stressing the emptiness of external appearances and the need to act in good faith rather than indulging in a form of self-deception, as she remarks, 'Por fazer engaño a todos / tú te dejas engañar' (ll. 635-636). The second quatrain of stanza LVIII sums up the judgement made of Soberuia: she does not seek 'la claridat', merely la 'la lunbre' (ll. 655-656).

Olivares now inserts sixteen new stanzas to augment Avariçia's defence (nos. 25-27, 28-30, 31-35, 36-40). She maintains that she acts from the desire to guard against poverty in old age and possible reversals of fortune in the future. She also expresses the satisfaction of being held in high esteem on account of her wealth and to be in the position to take revenge on her enemies. Finally, the ability to be able to lend money when it suits her is another factor that motivates the amassing of wealth. She argues, seemingly with good reason, that there is wisdom in wishing to be financially prudent to guard against the infirmity of old age, but Razón sees little point in hoarding wealth for the end of one's life. Using the nautical metaphor of a well-provisioned ship, she declares, 'con tanto lastre tu barca / ciará quando la remes' (ll. 719-720). Furthermore, material wealth does not necessarily bring peace and security when Fortune is unfavourable to us: 'Seguras del su conbate / son las casas pobrezillas, / los palacios y las sillas / de los ricos más abate' (ll. 729-732). In Olivares's second insertion in this section Voluntad defends the accumulation of wealth and the opportunities it brings her, but Razón assures her she will have no true friends and that her wealth will attract people, including members of her own family, only because they covet her riches: 'e tus parientes çercanos / desean de buena guerra / tener a ti so la tierra / y a lo tuyo entre sus manos (ll. 773-776). This is followed by five stanzas by Olivares in which the miser, rather than Voluntad, speaks. He objects to what he sees as Razón's lack of moderation in her remarks, repeating Avariçia's remarks about taking vengeance, and the ability to be generous (ll. 785-824). On the subject of vengeance Razón assures him that 'mucho más presto se venga / quien no tiene qué perder' (ll. 827-828). Perhaps what is most pertinent in the criticisms Razón makes against the miser is that she denounces the practice of usury and the cruelty of lending money at an extortionately high rate of interest: 'ca si das veynte por çiento / ya tu dádiva se viçia' (ll. 835-836).

In order to fulfil his declared intention of giving equal weight to Voluntad's role in the debate with Razón Olivares only needs to add two stanzas to Mena's when it is the turn of Luxuria to participate. What is striking about this exchange is that already in

Mena's stanzas Luxuria appears to be represented as gaining the upper hand: she has the last word in the exchange, dismissing Razón who is 'fatigada y afligida' (l. 1075). Mena's Luxuria acquits herself so well that Olivares can think of little that needs adding. What he does do, however, is to order Mena's stanzas differently so that Luxuria does not have the last word in the verbal battle with Razón. He brings Mena's stanzas LXXXVII-XCI forward so that in these verses of self-defence Luxuria interrupts Razón's scolding of her which begins in LXXIX. Olivares then allows Razón two more verses (Mena's LXXX and LXXXI) before inserting Mena's XCII, the stanza in which Luxuria in Mena's version appears to defeat Razón. At this point Olivares enhances Luxuria's self-justification with two stanzas, firstly with the thought that Luxuria brings benefits to human beings, ridding them of their 'suzia y torpe rudeza' (ll. 1018), rejuvenating the elderly and making the cowardly bolder. There is, however, a sinister note when Luxuria makes another claim suggesting another type of illicit relationship, so far not mentioned: 'fago paz entr'el andrado / e la madrastra feroce' (ll. 1023-1024), inserted perhaps to weaken the impact of Luxuria's defence. She then suggests that Razón should take a more rational approach to this debate and reflect on the positive effects she has on the world: 'pues, Razón, razón t'ofrezca / que loes el bien que tenga / con quanto al mundo conuenga / porque luzca y permanezca' (ll. 1031-1032). Olivares then uses Mena's remaining stanzas (LXXXII-LXXXVI), spoken by Razón, to end her confrontation with Razón. Since Mena tells us that Razón is 'al cabo vencedora' (l. 1076), this may explain why Olivares re-ordered Mena's verses so that Razón does indeed end up the victor. We cannot tell how Mena would have worded Prudencia's final judgement of her, but perhaps it is not unreasonable to infer that he wished to avoid taking a totally negative and blanket view of all human sexuality since some of Luxuria's claims are tenable, notably that she is responsible for the preservation of the human race.

The Continuation by Jerónimo de Olivares

Olivares's concern for a fair fight between Razón and Voluntad is carried over into his continuation of Mena's poem; in the three dialogues that he creates he gives Razón and each of the three remaining sins an equal number of stanzas. He opens with a brief exordium, lamenting that death takes from us those we value, such as Juan de Mena, and leaves behind those who should be taken (ll. 1185-1200). He invokes the spirit of Mena asking for guidance in finishing his work (ll. 1201-1208) and then embarks on the exchange between Razón and Gula.

Razón's initial criticism of Gula is short and contains the accusations 'Ningún bien veo que hagas, / todas edades estragas' (ll. 1230-1231) and 'Hazes estos males dos, / del vientre tuyo tu dios, / e de tu garganta gloria' (ll. 1238-40). Gula defends herself by telling Razón that she should not be so judgemental: 'Pregunto sin arrogancia, / entre la gana y sustancia / ¿quién terná medida justa?' (ll. 1246-1248). Both stanzas 53 and 54 have echoes of New Testament teaching, which is used out of context by Gula to try to support her case. In 53, for example, she says, 'Ni lo que entra por la boca / es lo que el ánima ensuzia, / mas lo que sale de huzia / que contra el próximo toca' (ll. 1269-1272), which is a reference to Christ's words to the Pharisees in Saint Matthew's gospel, 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man' (Matthew, 15, 11). Similarly in 54 Gula says, 'Cata si de sólo pan / biuiera la criatura, / no nos diera la natura / por pan sólo tanto afán' (Appendix: ll. 1277-1280), where she is again deliberately quoting Christ's words (Luke 4,4) out of context and interpreting them at their literal level. In rejecting this defence, Razón first tells Gula to think about the spiritual implications of what she has said: 'Quien deleyta su garganta, / puede ser dicho almicida' (Appendix: ll. 1313-1314) and then seizes upon Gula's misinterpretation of the gospels: 'Pues ni finjas fuerça tanta / en los testos que no sabes' (ll. 1317-1318). She ends her condemnation of Gula by saying that certainly man does not live by bread alone and neither should he depend on either Bacchus or Apollo, thereby rejecting drunkenness and the inspiration of the Muses. Instead he must heed the word of God.

Razón then turns to Embidia to denounce her as a destructive force: 'Eres hoguera que quema / lo que tú misma codicias' (ll. 1333-1334). The sin of envy is 'mezquino' (l. 1341) and brings permanent unhappiness: 'Andas turbio y tribulado, / con tus penas muy penado' (ll. 1350-1351). Embidia defends herself by asserting that she is misunderstood: it is actually through her influence that people are spurred on to correct their shortcomings. She inspires the young to virtuous acts, a claim that echoes the defence made Gómez Manrique's Embidia (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 1145-1149), and to rejuvenate the old. She argues that suffering is part of her condition and therefore her 'pena' absolves her from blame: 'Muy destinta y muy agena / es la pena de la culpa, / y pues pena me desculpa / la culpa no me condena' (Appendix: ll. 1377-1380).²² She concludes her self-defence with a striking use of antithesis to emphasize her case: '¡Qué tenga razón Embidia / y embidia la Razón tenga!' (ll. 1399-1400). Razón's response to

²² Could Embidia's reference to 'el apóstol' be an allusion to Romans 5, 1-5?

this is very weak since she fails to take the opportunity to point out to Embidia that there is a difference between the desire to achieve distinction by emulating a role-model and the resentment caused by envy of others' success. Instead she merely dismisses Embidia, condemning her roundly and saying, 'Vete pecado empecible, / do nadie por ti pene / [...] / pues eres a ti enojosa, / e a todos aborrecible' (ll. 1417-1418; 1423-1424).

Razón now expends five stanzas urging Pereza to rouse herself, reproaching her on the grounds that she is negligent, weak, reluctant to accept what is good, but always ready for what is bad. She supports scoundrels, flees from virtue, hates reading, dishonours old age and corrupts the young. Using antithesis, she sums up Pereza's condition, saying, 'Tú de pura holgazana / ninguna holgança tienes' (ll. 1447-1448) and goes on to accuse her of corrupting both the old and the young. Olivares then adds stanza, a long simile, to describe Pereza's awakening at her words: 'Como el que está desuelado / e por fuerça se ha dormido, / que si el sueño le han rompido / despierta desatinado, / e no bien en sí tornado / responde, gime, y bozea, / assí hizo la Pereza / oyendo lo razonado' (ll. 1465-1471). Pereza's response is in keeping with this description when she says, 'Déxame por Dios, Razón, / ca a penas sé qué dices' (ll. 1473-1474) and she begs to be left alone, claiming that her idleness does no one any harm. To her way of thinking, excessive reasoning can be damaging: 'El polir el razonar / y toda cosa curial, / si bien miras su metal, / mil vezes puede dañar' (ll. 1489-1492). Moreover, she maintains that other types of sinful acts are more harmful than hers which are only 'vagosos' (l. 1501), observing that diligent people are often poor, whereas the idle are rich; Razón replies to this in a very authoritarian manner: 'Calle, torpe floxedad / ni por tu habla procedas, / sino al tiempo que concedas / que yo tengo la verdad' (ll. 1529-1532), making it clear that she wants to hear no more from Pereza.

As Mena had promised in his poem (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 141-144), Prudencia now appears in order to cast her judgement (Appendix: ll. 1553-1560), but before doing so she observes that in confrontations such as that between Voluntad and Razón both parties believe themselves to be in the right. She then appeals to them to be at peace with one another, saying, 'Demos al biuir concordia / pues es lo que le fallece' (ll. 1579-1580) and condemns Voluntad for her 'torpeza' (l. 1590) above all, and the seven different sins that she represents. Razón, however, is much praised for her generosity and adherence to the truth. Prudencia pronounces her sentence, 'Que la Voluntad perezca, / y la Razón permanezca' (ll. 1606-1607) and states that she has not been swayed either by hope or fear. Olivares's voice speaks the final words of the poem

telling us that Razón and Voluntad, having heard the words of Prudencia, argued no more.

The Three Continuations

A comparison of these three approaches to Mena's unfinished poem can reveal much about Gómez Manrique's values: literary, moral and political.

Only Pero Guillén expands Mena's existing section on Yra, remarking that her crime is made worse when she is drunk. The subject of drunkenness recurs in the verses devoted to the sin of gluttony when Razón makes the accusation, 'tú fundaste con torpeza / bodegones y tavernas, / tú mantienes y gobiernas muchos viles en vileza' (Guillén de Segovia 1989: 246, ll. 108-111), underlining the social evils of such places. The defences put forward by Pero Guillén's Voluntad are generally weaker than those found in the other two continuations: they raise fewer moral and social issues and simply belabour the condemnation of sin. From a theological angle he considers the issue of free will in the exchange Razón has with Embidia, urging her to exert herself rather than assuming that fortune has not been favourable. Pero Guillén makes only fleeting biblical references, mentioning Adam in the Garden of Eden in connection with the sin of greed (ll. 50-51) and Abel in his section on envy (l. 152). Prudencia makes no appearance to give her final judgement, even though this is something that Mena had intended (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 141-144), but instead Pero Guillén uses five stanzas to reject all notions of classical mythology and goes on to urge readers to embrace more fully the Christian faith and achieve salvation by good works (Guillén de Segovia 1989: l. 498). This is an allusion to the epistle of Saint James which devotes thirteen verses on the subject and concludes, 'For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also' (James 2, 26).

Olivares, for all his self-declared authority and his enlisting of Mena's spirit, actually writes the least lively of the three continuations. Gula's defence is weak, even though she twice borrows Gómez Manrique's technique of quoting the same New Testament passages out of context in order to support her argument (Matthew, 15, 11; Luke, 4,4). Surprisingly, perhaps, these are the only biblical references that Olivares makes. When Embidia claims to inspire people to virtuous and noble acts Olivares's Razón does not take up the challenge that this argument presents, but merely condemns her in forthright terms. In replying to Pereza, who by her very nature is not going to offer much of a challenge, Razón makes no attempt to counter anything she has said in her defence, but instead cuts her short in peremptory fashion (Appendix: ll. 1529-1532).

Perhaps the reason for the weakness of Olivares's continuation lies in the fact that two of the sins he is treating, greed and sloth, are driven by physical needs and do not lend themselves to wider reflections on contemporary society.

Olivares's really strong point lies in his intercalated additions to Mena's original text: the role of Voluntad is greatly enhanced and there is a lively exchange of opinions in the dialogues that take place between Razón and the sins of pride and avarice. The various speeches in self-defence that Voluntad makes contain a variety of arguments. Some of them are shown to be untenable, but others are allowed largely to stand. One such example, although only touched upon briefly, concerns the status of the *letrado* whose cause Olivares champions in the dialogue with Souerbia who, priding herself on her superior knowledge, regrets that the learned are not accorded more praise and prestige. Although there is no mention of the topical debate about arms or letters, these stanzas (ll. 297-312) are surely an allusion to this very issue and a plea for a greater appreciation of the role of the *letrado* in contemporary society. Auaricia, before demonstrating the ugly aspects of her nature, also justifies herself on two counts that can be held as tenable: she is hoarding her wealth to provide for her old age (ll. 701-704) and is mindful of the vagaries of fortune that may plunge her into poverty (ll. 741-744).

Elsewhere the attitude adopted by Voluntad is quite clearly not intended to be the final word on the issues raised in the debate. For example, Soberuia's sanctimonious speech defending what she considers her piety is really a denunciation of religious hypocrisy on the part of Olivares. Another subject raised is the question of how to define nobility, a concept that was being discussed by other writers of the period. The fiercely defiant stand that Olivares's Soberuia takes epitomises the superior attitude of the old aristocracy who felt entitled to be held in respect and to be treated differently from the rest of society; they are in marked contrast to the ideas expounded by Razón in Mena's original poem. There Razón lays emphasis on the necessity for the individual of proving his nobility based on his own behaviour rather than relying on the reputation of his ancestors. Similar ideas on the true nature of nobility, as expounded by Mena, had already been expressed in greater detail by Diego de Valera whose *Espejo de la verdadera nobleza* was finished in 1451 and which may well have influenced the thinking of both these poets. Mena is thought to have had *converso* ancestry similar to that of Valera, who was known to be a New Christian and the son of a *converso*, and so belonged to a section of society that was keen to achieve equal status with the Old Christian nobility. His thoughts on the subject of civil nobility and its origins, in the

fifth chapter of his treatise, are worth noting when he declares ‘los mejores tiranos por más nobles fueron tenidos, e los que la natura iguales crió, la malicia desiguales fizo’ (Valera 1959: 95). For Valera nobility was a status that should be conferred on an individual by the Crown in recognition of qualities that showed that there were grounds for making a ‘diferencia entre él y los plebeos’ (98). Mena and Valera were not alone in considering the issue of nobility and its origins; it is a question that Gómez Manrique addressed in a poem to Fernando de Noya who responded, together with Pero Guillén de Segovia and Rodrigo Cota, in a manner that would certainly have been approved by Mena and Olivares (Gómez Manrique 2003: 253-260).

The treatment of the topic of usury, a matter raised in the debate between Razón and Auariçia is another moral issue that surfaces in this work and which Olivares chooses to develop. Mena refers to the fact that avarice has been portrayed in the past as a harpy or a wolf, but finds the crocodile to be a more apt comparison on the grounds that it has ‘grande la boca / y salida no ninguna’ (Appendix: ll. 915-516): once one is in the hands of a money-lender there is no escaping from his clutches. Since money-lending was in the hands of the Jewish community in medieval Spain, by raising this issue in connection with the sin of avarice, Mena is following a certain tradition of anti-Semitic writing which Olivares supports by inserting five stanzas, spoken by a miser, in which he attempts unsuccessfully to justify himself (ll. 873-904).

Gómez Manrique’s continuation is by far the longest and most detailed. He enters into the spirit of the unfinished original, producing exchanges between Razón and Voluntad that are considerably more complex and detailed and of a more abstract nature. He reveals himself as well-read: just as in the consolatory poem for his sister, he refers to events and characters of ancient history recorded by classical authors such as Livy (Gómez Manrique 2003: 514, ll. 1137-1144). There is also a reference to the mythological Orpheus, made famous by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses* (l. 1210), a book included in the inventory of his library (Gómez Manrique 1885: II, 334). He shows that he is acquainted with Saint Augustine, another writer represented in his library (Gómez Manrique 1885: II, 333; Gómez Manrique 2003: l. 1281) and holds up Saints Bernard and Martin as models of Christian behaviour (l.1282 & 1285).

The most striking difference between his work and that of the other two poets is his frequent citing of biblical texts and he reveals himself to be well versed in both the Old and New Testaments. He has greater recourse to the scriptures than either Pero Guillén or Olivares, going much further than merely citing biblical figures such as Absalom and Sampson (517, ll. 1209, 1212) as examples of beauty and strength

respectively, and Cain as the personification of envy when that sin is discussed (l. 1314). A particularly interesting technique that he uses in several instances is to allow Voluntad to use a biblical reference completely out of context in an attempt to support her argument. This occurs, for instance, in the exchange between Gula and Razón when Christ's words are quoted (Matthew 15, 11; Luke, 4, 4). Gómez Manrique's knowledge of the Bible allows him to go one further by also producing three Old Testament references for his Razón to counter what Gula has said (I Samuel, 14, 24-25, Genesis, 3, 1-19, and 19, 30-38). The same technique is used in the dialogue between Pereza and Razón with further citing of the gospels (Luke, 23, 42; 8, 2, Matthew, 15, 21-28; 26, 41, Mark, 14, 38; Luke, 22, 40-46 in that order) as well as one of an apocryphal text, the gospel of Nicodemus.

Although Mena's poem is ostensibly about different forms of sin, Gómez Manrique shifts the emphasis of the debate in the exchange between Razón and Envidia when he raises the question of one of the causes of envy, namely that of the fairness, or the lack of it, that human beings experience in their earthly life, where the distribution of natural talents, worldly goods and honours is concerned. This is highlighted first in the dialogue that takes place between Razón and Envidia when the latter declares, 'Todos somos de una masa / a la qual no tornaremos, / ¿pues, por qué razón seremos / desiguales en la tasa?' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 1105-1108). Razón has no very satisfactory answer to Envidia, since all she can say is, 'Mira que todos yguales / en este mundo venimos / y asimesmo morimos, / mas beuimos desiguales' (ll. 1189-1192). The same problem of the inequitable distribution of gifts is raised when Pereza, in similar vein, defends her idleness on the grounds that effort is not always justly rewarded and she is told to use the free will that human beings possess (ll. 1621-1624), an argument also used by Guillén de Segovia to silence Embidia (Guillén de Segovia 1989: ll. 284-287).

There is a certain irony in the fact that the complaint of Envidia, quoted above on the subject of inequality, uses similar language reported to have been uttered by Gómez Manrique on an occasion when, according to the chronicler Fernando del Pulgar, he found himself quelling an angry crowd in Toledo and accusing them of being motivated by envy of their more prosperous and successful *converso* neighbours: 'todos somos nacidos de un padre e de una masa, e ovimos un principio noble' (Pulgar 1943: 348). The fact that he can use this argument in two contrasting contexts suggests that he believed in the concept of the common origins of all mankind.

Why does Gómez Manrique, unlike Pero Guillén and Olivares, devote a number of stanzas at the end of his continuation to society's three estates, urging them to fulfil the destiny in life to which they were born? Perhaps this is because he can find no better answer to such age-old problems as social inequality and the vagaries of fortune, themes he chooses to introduce into the debates with both Envidia and Pereza when reflecting on what motivates men to sin. As a member of one of the most aristocratic families of Castile, he is relying here on the acceptance of the traditionally patrician attitude towards the existing social hierarchy, but there is also a certain element of self-contradiction to be found in the sentiments that he expresses. Although there is no doubt that he was proud of his descent, the above-mentioned speech to the Toledans includes a passage that reveals clearly that he believed that social boundaries were not impermeable: 'Vemos por experiencia algunos homes destos que juzgamos nacidos de baxa sangre, forzarlos su natural inclinación a dexar los oficios baxos de los padres, e aprender sciencia, e ser grandes letrados' (348).

Conclusion

Mena's last poetic project had clearly been an ambitious one: a dialogue between Razón and Voluntad on the seven deadly sins which went considerably beyond previous treatments of the topic by Spanish poets. The fact that rather than merely condemning the sins and their negative effects, he allows Voluntad to justify her actions strongly suggests that he was trying to establish what motivates human beings to follow their inclinations rather than listening to reason. Mena's text appears as very much a piece of work in progress, not only because he was only able to treat four of the seven sins before he died, but also because of the irregularities of the rhyme scheme in what he did write that Olivares saw fit to correct. Moreover, the last of the sins he wrote about, Yra, competes on equal terms with Razón and is preceded by Luxuria, who has a strikingly sound defence, all of which might lead the reader to surmise that, had he been granted more time, Mena would have expanded the role of Voluntad rather in the way that Olivares did.

Pero Guillén de Segovia's continuation is disappointing. Whereas both Gómez Manrique and Olivares use Mena's original poem as an opportunity to develop a personal train of thought on the subject of sin, albeit in very different ways, Pero Guillén does little more than concentrate on emphasizing the consequences of sin.

Olivares's decision to gloss Mena's work shows originality and independence of thought and the way in which his glosses engage with the original text are much more

interesting than his continuation which is disappointing and lacks the vigour of the intercalations. Some of the themes treated by Mena highlight important social and moral issues of a type which Olivares is able to bring into sharper focus with the verses that he inserts, above all those concerned with the sins of pride and avarice. Using Mena's unfinished poem as a springboard, he develops a critique of contemporary society, his focus being very much a realistic one that observes the defective behaviour and shortcomings of different sections of the society in which he lives and gives concrete examples of their actions and utterances.

Gómez Manrique's approach is diametrically opposed to that of Olivares, taking a more abstract and intellectual approach to the reasons why human beings sin. The substance of what he says is underpinned by a wealth of biblical and literary allusions in the debates between *Razón* and *Voluntad*, which almost without exception look to the past for examples of good and bad conduct to be followed or avoided. As elsewhere in his writing, Gómez Manrique reminds us of Seneca's warning that life on earth is but a journey towards death (Gómez Manrique 2003: 547, ll. 1983-1984) and that we should not value our material wealth since we cannot take it with us when we die (ll. 1985-1992). The final three stanzas of his poem, when he reminds us that we must all face a final judgement and enjoins us to love God and our neighbour, demonstrate that his aim in completing Mena's poem was to offer a spiritual guide to the problem of sin.

Chapter IV Cut and Thrust: Requests and Responses (c.1458-c.1470)

The *Coplas para Arias Dávila* and Pero Guillén de Segovia's Reply

It must have been at most only a few years after writing his continuation of Mena that Gómez Manrique had occasion to compose another long poem, the forty-seven nine-line *Coplas para Arias Dávila*, 'De los más el más perfecto' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 556-570). This is probably one of the earliest exchanges with other poets or their patrons that have come down to us from the late 1450s and much of the 1460s. Arias, who was a *converso*, was the *contador mayor* and a close advisor to Enrique IV and therefore occupied an important and influential position at court. He rose to become *contador mayor* to Enrique IV not long after the latter's accession to the throne of Castile. He was a controversial character who figures in various satirical poems of the period, such as the anonymous *Coplas del provincial* where he is the butt of an anti-Semitic jibe reminiscent of those made by Gómez Manrique to Juan de Valladolid: 'A ti, fray Diego Arias, puto / que eres y fuiste judío, / contigo no me disputo, / pues que tu pija capuz / nunca la tuvo ni tiene' (Rodríguez Puértolas, ed. 1981: 245, ll. 165-176). In the *Coplas de la panadera*, he is portrayed as a coward which was also a criticism frequently levelled at the Jews: 'Vi sentado en una estera / al segundo contador, / hablando como doctor, / vestido como partera, / y si lo que a él pareciera / se pudiera allí acabar, / él quisiera más estar / cien leguas allende Vera' (139-140, ll. 213-220).

The chronicler Alonso de Palencia, who was an outspoken critic of Enrique IV and those close to him, gives us some information about Arias Dávila, claiming that he was a *converso* of humble origins who left his native city of Ávila to go to Segovia where he became a pedlar of spices amongst other things. He leaves us in no doubt about his opinion of Arias, as he declares that he was selling 'cosas infimas robadas a otros' (Palencia 1998: 1, 57) and also tells us that he bought a horse that would carry him away swiftly whenever he needed to escape the wrath of any peasant attempting to obtain justice following 'algún atropello cometido contra uno de los vecinos' (58). Arias must have attracted the attention of, and found favour with, the infante Enrique who was living in Segovia during the 1440s, since it was he who intervened to save Arias from execution when he was found guilty of committing a crime of some sort. Palencia was of the opinion that this was the turning-point in his career despite his ability to ingratiate himself with people: 'Ni siquiera con estas artes habría acrecentado sus riquezas si no hubiese cometido, según la fama, un crimen muy infame y merecedor de

la prisión y pena capital' (58). A further step in Arias's rise to power was his appointment by Enrique as a tax collector and, not long after Enrique's accession to the Castilian throne, he was appointed *contador mayor* to the king. Since there were already two men, Juan de Vivero and Alfonso Álvarez de Toledo, who had been appointed for life to similar posts by Juan II, it seems that hostility and suspicion were aroused by this appointment (*Crónica anónima* 1991: I, 14).

As time went on Arias seems to have become a trusted counsellor to the king and a very rich man in the process, mentioned on a number of occasions in connection with the corruption of officials: the *corregidores* according to Palencia 'mejor deben llamarse *merecedores de corrección*' (Palencia 1998: I, 101). Encouraged by Arias to wage war against the Moors, Enrique raised troops two years running, sending ambassadors to Rome to plead permission for the sale of indulgences to finance these campaigns. A papal bull was received at Christmas 1456 to allow the raising of funds for this purpose and a very large sum of money was raised. According to Diego de Valera, despite the preaching of Enrique's confessor, Alonso de Espina, who declared that this should be spent on a crusade against the Moors, 'muy poca parte se gastó en la guerra de los moros' (Valera 1941: 41). Both Valera and Palencia recount that this caused disquiet amongst the grandees of the kingdom, Palencia believing that it was the beginning of the split in the kingdom with the conde de Haro, Pedro Fernández de Velasco, assuming the leadership of the rebels because he could rely on 'la rectitud del arzobispo de Toledo, con la fortaleza del almirante y con la magnanimidad y prudencia del conde de Alba' (Palencia 1998: 152). These events would culminate in the dethronement of Enrique's effigy and the crowning of the infante Alfonso in Ávila in 1465.

In an article on Arias Dávila, María Eugenia Contreras Jiménez examines the evidence that had survived regarding his profile. She comments on the anti-Semitic allusions to the *contador* in the satirical *Coplas de la panadera* and the *Coplas del provincial*, but points out that some researchers into his genealogy have claimed that he was of Old Christian descent (Contreras Jiménez 1985: 475-477). She also emphasizes that since Arias was so close to Enrique IV, the chroniclers' accounts vary greatly according to their political leanings, Palencia being highly critical of the king and Arias, whereas Enríquez del Castillo was an ardent supporter of Enrique and hardly mentions Arias. Rather surprisingly, Contreras makes only a rather cursory allusion to Gómez Manrique's poem, drawing no conclusions from it in the section of her article, 'Diego Arias Dávila visto por sus coetáneos' (482-486), and making no mention of the letter

written to accompany it. Gómez Manrique may have experienced some satisfaction regarding his difficult relations with Arias. He was appointed governor of Ávila by the infante Alfonso after the latter had been crowned king by the rebels in 1465 and Contreras's researches at the archives of Simancas reveal that shortly after this event Alfonso wrote to Gómez Manrique to authorize him to requisition all property owned by Diego and Pedro Arias Dávila in the city and diocese of Burgos. Diego Arias died on the first day of 1466 and the following summer Gómez Manrique was instructed to collect the income derived from this property (489).

Gómez Manrique's Letter

Gómez Manrique's *Coplas* were composed in response to a request from Arias who was withholding the payment from Gómez Manrique of a 'libranza',²³ or bill of exchange, presumably for a sum of money owed by the Crown and which needed to be disbursed by the king's *contador mayor*. Arias asked for a poem before he would agree to pay and Gómez Manrique assents, prefacing his poem with a letter in prose (Gómez Manrique 2003: 553-556). By setting such terms Arias was, in a sense, adding insult to injury, since he was already indebted to Gómez Manrique, but the latter expresses no overt indignation. Neither does he engage in any flattery in his letter, although he was addressing a man who held an elevated position at court. Instead, he offers a series of veiled insults, beginning by saying that the request has provoked a variety of different thoughts: being asked to write a poem leads him to wonder if his previous efforts were either unsatisfactory or else so very pleasing that Arias Dávila clamours for more. He uses the modesty topos in a subtle way to nudge Arias, saying that if he had to live on what he could earn by his verses and the *mercedes* granted to him by the king, he would be poor indeed: 'entiendo por cierto que sería muy mal mantenido, según yo trobo e vos, señor, me libráis' (554). He continues by claiming that he does not know what has led Arias to make his request, comparing his wish to respond to 'aquella misma neçesydad que a las brauas aves faze yr al desacostunbrado señuelo' (555). In so saying he shows an awareness of being lured into uncharted territory that may ensnare him. The pretence of modesty is maintained when he describes his poem as 'esta ruda obra [...] cuyo grueso estilo vos fará manifiesta la ynorançia de su fazedor' (554). There follows a self-deprecating analogy between his supposed ignorance of literary technique and the indisciplined nobles of ancient Rome who, according to Gaius Marius, 'eran

²³ A definition of this is given as 'orden de pago, expresada generalmente por carta, que da una persona contra otra, que posee fondos del que la expide, para que pague a un tercero' (Diccionario Planeta).

ombres reuesados, pues antes querían ser maestros que diçiplos’ (554), thus warning that the content of the poem he has composed for Arias will be didactic and implying that it will be salutary for the addressee.

This letter also reflects the politically troubled times in which Gómez Manrique lived when he tells Arias that he is aware that his writings may be ‘en algo más agras o menos dulçes [...] que la calidat del tienpo requiere’ (555), but he declares that he lives without hope or fear and that Fortune has been favourable to him. In saying that he holds out no hopes to the future, he alludes directly to Sallust’s *Conspiracy of Catiline*, but the influence of Seneca can also be seen here when he declares himself ‘libre de esperança e de miedo’ (555). A similar thought is expressed by Seneca to Lucilius when he quotes a fellow Stoic writer: ““Cease to hope,” he says, “and you will cease to fear.” [...] Widely different though they (hope and fear) are, the two of them march in unison like a prisoner and the escort he is handcuffed to. [...] both belong to a mind in suspense, to a mind in a state of anxiety through looking to the future. Both are mainly due to projecting our thoughts far ahead of us instead of adapting ourselves to the present’ (Seneca 1969: 38). Since a copy of *Las epístolas de Seneca a Lucilio* is listed in the inventory of Gómez Manrique’s library (Gómez Manrique 1886: II, 333), it is probable that he actually read Seneca rather than merely extracting an appropriate quotation from one of the compilations available at the time.

Thinking of the debt he is owed by the royal treasury, Gómez Manrique reminds Arias that he has served the king during ‘la mayor parte de mi niñez’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 555) and hopes to continue doing so, but anticipating one of the themes of the poem to come, he shows little concern for such worldly concerns. Instead, preferring to walk the moral high ground, he tells Arias that if he will not pay up, he should think of some other reply to make since he, Gómez Manrique, has complied with the first by writing him a poem. He ends by saying that he will not be prolix, since he realises how busy Arias is, and in a final protestation of modesty, begs him not to find fault with his work due its lack of aesthetic merit and flattery, but to accept it for ‘la voluntad e claridad de ánimo con que [...] se fizo’ (555-556), since it was he who asked for it from someone ‘quien más no sabía’ (556).

The Coplas

After seven introductory stanzas the poem can be divided thematically into four sections, unity being achieved by the way Gómez Manrique links them together with continual emphasis on the transitory nature of worldly wealth, honours and social status.

The first three stanzas contain an invocation to Christ, as the Word Incarnate, to help him express himself with wisdom and elegance and by so doing he sets the moral and religious tone of the work. In the second verse we have a foretaste of what is to come when the poet addresses Christ as one who not only enables the mute to speak but also says, '[faze] los bajos sobir / e los altos deçendir' (ll. 11-12), lines that not only reflect the turbulent times in which he is writing, but are also an uncomfortable reminder to the dedicatee of the meteoric rise he has experienced so far in his own life. In the following introductory four stanzas Arias is addressed as 'buen señor' (l. 28) and 'señor e grande amigo' (l. 39) and, as in his letter, Gómez Manrique claims that his work is not of great quality. He reveals some self-awareness in the way he wishes to avoid sounding sanctimonious at the start of the fifth verse when he says, 'E no mires mis pasiones / y grandes viçios que sigo' (ll. 37-38). There is a certain diplomatic deference when he explains the brevity of his introduction on the grounds that he knows Arias to be a man much occupied with his 'negoçiaçiones e grandes preocupaçiones' (ll. 48-49), but this could also be interpreted as a snide allusion to the time Arias devoted to the business dealings which enabled him to feather his own nest. These opening stanzas end with the injunction: 'Desde agora ten atentos / los oýdos' (ll. 62-63), leaving the reader in no doubt as to the serious nature of the content to follow.

The first section, stanzas VIII to XVII, concerns the theme of the vagaries of fortune. It opens with the words '¡O tú, en amor ermano, / naçido para morir' (ll. 64-65), a sentiment echoing the words of Seneca in his consolatory letter to Marcia on the death of her son: 'his death was proclaimed at his birth; into this condition was he begotten, this fate attended him straightaway from the womb' (Seneca 1932: 31). This is followed by a warning that Arias should not place too much importance on worldly pleasures, goods and honours since they are ephemeral. In stanza IX Gómez Manrique uses a stock metaphor by referring to the life's problems as 'esta mar alterada' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 559, l. 73) before warning Arias how quickly the wheel of fortune can turn. There follows a reminder of the destruction of ancient cities in the past and the downfall of powerful leaders, and in stanza XII the tone becomes darker when mention is made of the more recent turbulence of 'nuestras regiones' (l. 101) and the evidence of the damage caused that still exists there, perhaps an allusion to the first battle of Olmedo. Gómez Manrique is much more direct in the way he writes to Arias in XIII when he uses the imagery of a storm again in connection with the struggles of political life, 'Que tú mesmo viste muchos / en estos tienpos pasados, / de grandísimos estados /

fácilmente derrocados / con pequeños aguaduchos' (ll. 109-113). Political power is then likened to 'vn muy feble metal de vedrío' (ll. 116-117), easily shattered.

Still on the subject of fortune, Gómez Manrique now reflects on the fickleness of human relationships in political circles. Arias was known to be close to Enrique IV and to be one of his *privados*, but he is warned not to place too much trust in 'la mundana priuança' (Gómez Manrique 2003: l. 119), as friends may disappear and he will be on his own if he loses his status. Indeed, Gómez Manrique warns Arias that the respect that people show him is motivated by self-interest: 'De los que vas por las calles / en torno todo çercado, / con çirimonias tratado, / no serás más aguardado / de quanto tengas que dalles' (ll. 136-140). Stanza XVII contains an example of this when Arias is reminded of how Álvaro de Luna, Juan II's favourite, was deserted by his supporters and met his end. If Gómez Manrique intended this poem as a token of friendship for Arias, this is an unfortunate remark since there is a clear parallel between him and Luna. Both men had a swift rise to power and enjoyed a close relationship with Enrique IV and Juan II respectively, who in turn were known to lean heavily on their *privados* for advice.

The second section, stanzas XVIII to XXV, contains advice to Arias as to how he should conduct himself, with Gómez Manrique suggesting that Arias should model himself on the *alcalde cadañero* who, knowing that his term of office lasts but a year, is at pains to be temperate in his actions so as to be judged favourably at the end of that year. As long as he retains a powerful position Arias should try to be loved by all, or at least, not hated. Using a nautical simile by comparing the state to a ship that has many oarsmen, Gómez Manrique reminds Arias that he has to relate to many people, oarsmen and passengers alike. This means that a man who wields great power should see to it that he is not feared, but instead should try to be 'querido / de los buenos, / o por no ser, a lo menos, / aborrido' (ll. 177-180). In stanza XXI he spells out how this can be achieved: respect, good treatment and patience need to be shown to men from all walks of life. In the following verses Gómez Manrique takes Arias to task for failing to comply with this norm and his tone betrays the indignation of an aristocrat when he implies that Arias does not know how to behave towards members of the nobility: 'e no fagan los portales / tus porteros / a bestias y caualleros / ser yguales' (ll. 195-198).

There is sarcasm in the way he declares that he does not agree with those who make out that Arias is a criminal when he says, 'Según lo que de ti veo, / algunos te fazen reo / e reputan por culpante; / mas yo dudo de tu seso / que mandase / que bien e mal se pesase / con vn peso' (ll. 201-207). By using the word 'peso', meaning both a

‘balance scale’ or the weight of coinage, Gómez Manrique is pointing the finger of blame at Arias and suggesting that his decisions are swayed by underhand financial considerations. Several of the chroniclers of the period make allusions to the way coins were minted; one of these was Diego de Valera who commented on Enrique IV’s activities: ‘Y mandó fazer moneda mucho más baxa que la quel rey don Juan su padre labró, y la quel rey don Enrrique su abuelo avía mandado labrar, que era mucho mejor, e mandó fundir, por aver alguna ganancia, con gran daño a sus súbditos’ (Valera 1941: 64). Alfonso de Palencia also had something to say about the decisions that Arias took regarding the minting of coins: ‘La moneda sufría alteraciones y devaluaciones frecuentes en daño público, para que las rentas reales se incrementasen y luego se pagasen con ganancias de la nueva tasa del dinero’ (Palencia 1998: 141). Angus MacKay explains the situation in greater detail than Atlee and traces the debasement of the coinage in reigns previous to that of Enrique IV, but both he and Atlee view the writ issued by Enrique in 1464, when he banned all minting of coins in Castile with the exception of the mint in Segovia, as an important event. MacKay explains that two weeks after this writ was issued a manifesto was produced by Enrique’s opponents which refers to the alteration of the coinage and he quotes from the anonymous *Memorias de Don Enrique IV de Castilla* to reveal the intensity of feeling on the subject (MacKay 1981: 72-73). Another reference to Arias’s underhand financial dealings occurs in stanza XXIV when Gómez Manrique refers to dishonest behaviour of landlords towards their workers, implying that Arias was involved in these practices also. By punishing such actions, not only will Arias win the people’s affection but he will also be at an advantage in the world to come.

The ephemeral nature of worldly goods and honours is the theme of the third section, stanzas XXVI to XXXI. Here Gómez Manrique makes the point that those who rise highest and are most feared in this world are also more fearful of what they may lose. He declares that wealth and honours are only on loan to us during our lifetime, and in so saying, he again echoes the words of Seneca: ‘honours, wealth, spacious halls [...] these are not our own but borrowed trappings’ (Seneca 1932: 29). Arias is reminded of figures from the past who rose to fame, such as Alexander, Hercules and Midas, the latter famous for his ability to turn everything he touched to gold, but there is a warning to Arias to remember that he may be travelling towards eternal damnation. He drives this home in XXIX and XXX, warning Arias that when he dies he will take nothing with him except for his shroud. He advises him to lose no sleep over trying to obtain ‘lo que tiene de fyncar / con su dueño’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 565, ll. 260-261). This is

obviously another reference to Arias's underhand dealings of the kind that Palencia mentions in connection with the *ferias* at Medina which 'ofrecían robos, violencias, exacciones y abusos al capricho de Diego Arias' (Palencia 1998: 141). This accusation is followed by an observation on the part of Gómez Manrique that the material world is like a master against whom Arias is constantly fighting; that he is motivated by greed and that in the end this will bring regret.

The fourth and final section of the poem, stanzas XXXII to XLV, treats the theme of the trials and tribulations of those in high office and possessors of great wealth. Having mentioned the burdens carried by kings, princes, prelates of the church and the aristocratic armed forces, he suggests in stanza XXXIX that 'los fauoridos priuados' (l. 343) of princes are also subject to the same onerous duties, this being a direct hint to Arias that he should take stock of his own situation as one who is so close to the king. Gómez Manrique refers to the constant stream of attention in the form of 'seruiçios y presentes' (l. 346) that Arias must receive in his position, implying that these are bribes and using a particularly unpleasant simile to describe them: 'como piedras a tablados' (l. 347). Since the 'tablado' was the scaffold where a condemned man might be stoned while waiting to be executed, this line has been interpreted as deliberate insult to Arias who was once condemned to death but saved at the last moment, reputedly by Enrique IV according to Palencia (Atlee 2007: 195; Palencia 1998: 58). He also suggests that Arias might well find the pressures of his life such that he would rather exchange his grand residence for somewhere humbler: 'que las tus ricas moradas / por las choças o ramadas / de los pobres trocarías' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 372-374). The final two stanzas urge Arias yet again not to place his trust in human beings or rely on temporal goods, but to think of assuring himself a dwelling-place for his soul in the life to come. Gómez Manrique's advice recalls the parable in Saint Matthew's gospel about the man who built his house on a rock so that it survived the elements and suggests that Arias do likewise: 'E no fundes tu morada / sobre tan feble çimiento, / mas elige con gran tiento / otro firme fundamento / de más eterna durada' (Matthew: 7, 24-27; Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 415-419).

Although delivering a solemn message to its dedicatee, the poem's literary merit with its use of figures of speech should not be ignored. Gómez Manrique first uses the rather stock metaphor of the journey through life, with the challenges that man faces, being compared to a voyage at sea with its attendant storms in stanza IX, making it plain that all people are vulnerable: 'En esta mar alterada / por do todos navegamos' (ll. 73-75). He develops this with a more original figure of speech when he declares that

worldly pleasures are as transient as the spray given off with the breaking of the waves: ‘no duran más que rociada’ (l. 77). Another metaphor linked to the idea of navigating our way through life occurs in stanza XV when Arias is warned of the fickle nature of those supposed friends when they realise that their friendship will reap no more benefits. It is as if they are becalmed because ‘falleçen en el estrecho / como agua de laguna’ (ll. 130-131). In stanza XX the state is seen as a ship that is rowed by many but also has to carry many passengers, leading to the advice that it is imperative to forge harmonious relationships between rulers and subjects. The image of the oarsmen is taken up again in stanza XXXIX when it is used to stress the intensity of the pressures experienced by *privados* such as Arias who, ‘en las sábanas d’Olanda / más sospiran / que los remantes que tiran / en la vanda’ (ll. 348-351).

There are also several imaginative similes expressing the brevity of worldly pleasures and honours and comparing these with the ephemeral quality of flowers, for example in VIII: ‘viçios, bienes, onores / que procuras / pásanse como frescuras / de las flores’ (ll. 69-72). Similarly, the value of worldly wealth is short-lived since ‘estas cosas, / [...] no duran más que rosas / con eladas’ (ll. 232-234) and again in XLVI human beings and their material wealth ‘más presto que rosales / pierden la fresca verdor’ (ll. 409-410). The destructive force of fire is another way that Gómez Manrique emphasizes the transient nature of fame, since it vanishes, ‘transitoria como flama / d’aguardiente’ (ll. 98-99). A similar image in the penultimate stanza is used to describe the way an increase in personal wealth can bring only a fleeting gain: ‘e no son sus creçimientos / sino juego, / menos turable que fuego / de sarmientos’ (ll. 411-414). Arias’s preoccupation with material wealth is also reflected in the metaphor in stanza XIII, which has already been mentioned, when political power is seen as ‘vn muy feble metal / de vedrío’ (ll. 116-117).

Gómez Manrique chooses the rhyme scheme of ABbBACdDc, taking full advantage of this and the *pie quebrado*. One particularly effective example occurs in stanza IX when Arias is warned of the way the wheel of fortune can turn and change the course of our lives: ‘¡O, pues, tú, onbre mortal, / mira, mira / la rueda quán presto gira / mundanal!’ (ll. 78-81). The use of the rhyme of ‘mortal’ with ‘mundanal’ emphasizes human mortality, while that of ‘mira’ with ‘gira’ stresses the urgency of the poet’s message. Moreover, the shortened seventh and ninth lines, with their interruption of the metre, underline the poet’s message still further. Another striking example, in stanza XIII, again on the subject of changes in fortune, reads, ‘qu’el ventoso poderío / tenporal / es vn muy feble metal / de vedrío’. The rhyme of ‘tenporal’ with ‘metal’ underlines the

fact that the value of money is not everlasting, while there is an implied antithesis in the rhyme of 'poderío' with 'vedrío', since political power can be shattered as easily as glass.

This poem has been interpreted in various ways by scholars. Both Kenneth Scholberg (1971) and Julio Rodríguez Puértolas (1981) included it in anthologies of satirical literature, the former also commenting on it in a chapter on political satire in his book *Sátira e invectiva en la España medieval* (Scholberg 1971: 246-249). Carl W. Atlee (2007) published an article in which he explores its satirical content, a valuable contribution to criticism on Gómez Manrique, giving much information about the political and economic background to the times in which the poem was written. What Atlee does not do, however, is to define what he means by satire. Satire is generally considered to involve ridicule by focusing on features of a person's character, appearance, manner of speaking or behaviour, and exaggerating the portrayal to the point when it usually becomes a humorous and grotesque caricature. This poem contains neither ridicule nor humour, so I cannot agree that it is a satire, but consider it to be a reflection on moral values that are grounded in Christian theology.

Although Arias was a *converso*, Gómez Manrique does not lower himself to making any jibes about his ethnicity, in spite of the fact that this section of Castilian society came in for much criticism for amassing large amounts of wealth by allegedly underhand means. It is also worth remembering that Gómez Manrique was capable of anti-Semitic outbursts, such as those he made to Juan de Valladolid. David Gitlitz, whose research shows how the Arias Dávila family retained strong ties with the Jewish community of Segovia, observes that Gómez Manrique had sufficient vision not to write an anti-Semitic poem because 'no quería arriesgar que Arias tapara sus oídos ante algo que interpretara como una típica satírica polémica anti-conversa' (Gitlitz 1996: 18). Atlee, however, chooses to comment on Gómez Manrique's use of the verb 'conuertir' twice in his invocation to Christ in the second verse: 'fazes los baxos sobir / e los altos deçendir; / tú que fazes conuertir / los muy torpes en agudos, / conuierte mi gran rudeza' (ll. 11-15). He remarks, 'the reference in particular to Christ's ability to elevate the "baxos" and to diminish the power of the "altos" curiously mirrors Arias's own advancement in the kingdom. Furthermore, Manrique's polyptoton of "conuertir" and "conuierte", in the light of Arias's Judaic background, does not appear to be coincidental' (Atlee 2007: 188). This interpretation may be reading more into these lines than was intended; if they were meant to be an insult, it is certainly a very heavily

disguised one.²⁴ Whatever the intention, it is interesting to see how Gómez Manrique's contemporaries deliver their insults to Arias Dávila because they are infinitely more defamatory and also calculated to amuse those with anti-Semitic leanings.

I think that this poem has to be read on two levels: not just for what it tells us about some of the players on the fifteenth-century Castilian political scene, but for its literary qualities. I have already attempted to emphasize the effective use of similes, and note that Scholberg remarks: 'Lo que más impresiona son las magníficas figuras que recalcan la fugacidad de todo' (Scholberg 1984: 35). Vidal González also appreciates the poem from a double perspective: 'Sería pecar de simplismo [...] si nos quedáremos tan sólo en la crítica a la actitud de Diego Arias o la sátira política. El poema va mucho más allá, es una lección de filosofía y moral cristiana' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 62). If we ignore the admonitions directed at Arias, and focus on the central theme of the brevity of life and ephemeral value of all things temporal, the poem has a timeless and universal significance for all mankind.

Pero Guillén de Segovia's Response to Gómez Manrique's Letter and Coplas

Pero Guillén de Segovia reacts to Gómez Manrique's *Coplas* in the form of a prose letter and a poem written as if by Arias Dávila himself. In the opening paragraph of the letter Pero Guillén quotes Seneca to the effect that any benefits we receive should not be repaid without interest, which presumably is a way of justifying the composition of the stanzas that follow. Pero Guillén is at pains to make clear to Gómez Manrique that he needs to be more circumspect in what he says. The words that he puts into Arias's mouth admit that he has received a moral lesson, but that it is without just cause or, as he says, 'sin aver intervenido causa que permitirlo pudiese' (Guillén de Segovia 1989: 144). Furthermore, he reminds Gómez Manrique that the wise man is careful about the advice he offers to others and pointedly quotes Saint Gregory on the subject of those who take pleasure in hearing about the misdeeds of others: 'quel que se deleyta en oyr crymenes ajenos come las carnes de los onbres' (144). The letter shows an awareness that Arias realised that Gómez Manrique was speaking about him in the *coplas* when he declares, 'que se puede colegir que en vos, señor, dar fe aquello creyendo de my lo fablase' (144). The defensive tone of the letter continues with the reflection that Saint Thomas (presumably Aquinas), in a book that he wrote in the 'mirror of princes' genre, declared that there was nothing of so little value as the 'la

²⁴ Much depends on whether the verb 'conuertir' would have carried the same connotations as the noun 'converso' in fifteenth-century Spain.

gloria e el onor del favor de las gentes' (145). This is because such accolades, since they depend on human judgement, are not of lasting value, and a quotation from the prophet Isaiah, very much echoing the sentiments expressed in Gómez Manrique's *coplas*, is brought in to support this view: 'la gloria e favor de este mundo es como flor de feno' (145). Indeed, the voice of Arias contends that rather than making himself 'siervo de vil materia', the prudent man will ignore the vagaries of fortune and instead will do all he can to lead a virtuous life so that he 'dome o resista la feroçidad de los monstruosos actos' (145).

The poem that follows the letter consists of forty-seven nine-line stanzas with the rhyme scheme ABbBACdDc, with a *pie quebrado* in the seventh and ninth lines, mirroring Gómez Manrique's poem exactly. The first three stanzas express a mixture of flattery and assumed modesty, with an ironic invocation to God to guide him as he presumes to address a knight of such nobility. Stanzas IV-VII are defensive in that he considers that he works very hard but is fair in his dealings: 'que sin desvios / trato los buenos / y que los males agenos e por mios' (147-148, ll. 43-46). He is aware of the fact that there are some people who delight in negative criticism: 'Usan del modo blasfemio / en maldezir convertido' (ll. 56-57) and urges Gómez Manrique not to heed what others may say, suggesting that those who do not pursue a virtuous life are sometimes tempted to grumble. What is interesting here is that the poet uses the first person plural in stanza IX: 'Quen esta vida lazerada / donde prestados no estamos / los que a virtud no miramos / muchas veces murmuramos / de la cabsa no cabsada; tal material no es moral / ni satira / mas es pasion de la Yra / natural' (ll. 75-83), which is a way of telling Gómez Manrique that he is addressing his comments to the wrong person. At the same time, however, Pero Guillén softens the rebuke with his use of the first person plural, thus suggesting that we are all capable of making similar errors.

In stanza XI Arias admits that the advice offered him by Gómez Manrique is wise and in XI notes that some men, although gifted, commit 'muy feos pecados' (l. 112) and do not exercise their free will as reason would dictate. There is a self-righteousness in much of what he says. For example, he considers that he has always conducted himself in 'estilo moderado' (l. 169) and, commenting on the downfall of the powerful, he again uses the first person plural suggesting that they should seek to follow a virtuous life: 'sigamos obras fundadas / virtuosas / y dexemos las dapñosas / reprobadas' (ll. 233-236). Just as Gómez Manrique professed scorn for earthly riches, Arias echoes the same attitude (ll. 255-263), observing that death does not respect the rich (ll. 264-272) and, in facing death, all social classes are equal: 'los que aran con

bueyes / de los perllados y reyes / ciertamente son yguales' (ll. 367-369). He expresses the hope that his good works will assure him a place in heaven: 'ser por obras me procuro / en lo eterno conlocado' (ll. 395-396). The final stanza is polite; Arias declares that Gómez Manrique will be compensated for his efforts and that the debt that he is owed will be repaid.

Pero Guillén obviously took great care in writing this poem and its accompanying letter. The way in which the stanzas are structured, using not just the same rhyme scheme, but the identical rhymes for each verse, reveals minute attention to detail and leads Carl Atlee to suggest that Arias might have paid Pero Guillén to write this response.²⁵ If this is so, he interprets it as 'an acknowledgement of the impact that Manrique's *Coplas* had on the kingdom' and 'a covert admission on the part of the treasurer that he was publicly disgraced' (Atlee 2007: 197). Pero Guillén also responded to Gómez Manrique's *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación*, urging him to be less outspoken, and his reply to the *Coplas* for Arias are similarly written in order to have a restraining influence. Whether Pero Guillén was paid to write by Arias or was motivated for other reasons, what is significant is that not only did Gómez Manrique display moral courage in speaking out to a man who was so close to the monarch, but he also had the satisfaction of seeing that his address in prose and verse had clearly hit its mark.

Preguntas y Respuestas

The response to Arias Dávila stands out from the other poetic exchanges in that it was written from a position of political inferiority to his interlocutor. The other poems of this kind that he wrote fall much more neatly into the generic mould of a genre practised widely at the time and amply documented in the *cancioneros*. Gómez Manrique and his many correspondents maintained this tradition, although the range of subjects they covered was narrower than that of their predecessors, as Daniela Capra observes: 'falta, en Gómez Manrique, la preocupación por algunos asuntos filosóficos o morales frecuentes en la poesía de debate medieval (meditaciones sobre la muerte, las siete virtudes, la trinidad de Dios)' (Capra 1992: 190). Most examples of this aspect of his art were produced during his time in archbishop Carrillo's household, although a number of exchanges with other poets survive, which I will discuss first. One poem of

²⁵In responding in this way Pero Guillén is following the example of Gómez Manrique when he replies to Torroella's *Coplas*.

particular interest that has not been clearly linked with this period is addressed to Pedro de Mendoza.

Pedro de Mendoza

Scholars are in some disagreement as to the identity of this Pedro de Mendoza, as Vidal González remarks: ‘Varios son los poetas que aparecen con este nombre en los manuscritos del siglo XV, todos ellos señores de Almazán’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 233n). There is no clue in the text to the date of composition of this dialogue, but Julio Rodríguez Puértolas thinks that Gómez Manrique was addressing Juan II’s *guarda mayor* who was imprisoned on more than one occasion (Rodríguez Puértolas 1981: 191). José Luis Pérez López, however, claims that this Mendoza, as the nephew of the marqués de Santillana, was *guarda mayor* to Enrique IV and quotes various instances of letters to Pedro from the marqués as well as references to other events at which they were both present (López Pérez 1994: 767-779). Perhaps it does not really matter which Pedro de Mendoza was the recipient of this poem, since Gómez Manrique and members of the Mendoza family lived in troubled times when strife between the nobility and the crown was frequent and imprisonment was a misfortune that befell many a nobleman who found himself on the losing side. What makes this exchange interesting is the way in which a parody of a courtly love poem, using a stock metaphor, is used to convey a more serious message reflecting the turmoil of the time, and its recipient responded in a similar vein.

The opening lines of the poem of four *octavas* and a four-line *fin*, ‘La ynmensa turbación’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 233-235), reveal that Gómez Manrique is living through one of the many times of turmoil that he experienced during his life. He regrets how the time he was accustomed to spend in the evenings reading is now taken up with constant patrols and vigils: ‘El tiempo bien despendido / en las liberales artes, / en cauas y baluartes / es agora conuertido’ (ll. 9-12), using this as a way of excusing the quality of this piece. The question is posed in the third stanza, ‘quál vos es más molesta, / vuestra secreta prisión / o la vulgar detención / que vos es por el rey puesta (ll. 21-24). Here he juxtaposes the two concepts of the word ‘prison’, one that is abstract referring to Pedro’s love interests, and a reminder of the stock metaphor of the ‘cárcel de amor’ used so frequently in courtly love poetry of this period to express the supposed refinement and intensity of a poet’s sentiments. It is in stark contrast to the reality of the physical prison, the ‘vulgar detención’ that Pedro is currently experiencing. In the following verse Gómez Manrique observes that although the two types of imprisonment

are very different they both deprive the prisoner of his freedom, but that in answering his own question he would consider the gaoler when deciding which option he would choose.

Pedro opens his reply, 'Pues vos sobra la razón' (236-237), by flattering Gómez Manrique, saying that he is a man of abundant reason and urges him to overcome the inhumanity of the times. He adds that the period in which they are living is one which allows no man to sleep but rather, spurs him into action: 'a quien él falla durmiendo / fiérello con las espuelas' (ll. 7-8). The order of the second and third stanzas appears to have been reversed as Pedro's third stanza both matches the rhyme scheme and responds to the content of Gómez Manrique's second.²⁶ In it he observes that in the current circumstances everyone is taking up arms and that this activity must take precedence over literary pursuits: 'troquemos oy la çiençia / por roçín que bien corriere' (ll. 23-24). In the second verse Pedro answers the question posed by Gómez Manrique in his third verse, saying that he finds no solace in poetry and in the fourth verse he declares that he would sooner remain in prison a whole year than suffer the pain of love for a single day. The *fin* ends on a despairing note when he says that if he is writing nonsense it is 'por fallarme yo estrangero / d'esperança que tenía' (ll. 35-36).

At first this dialogue could be seen as just another on the subject of courtly love or the decision to be made between pursuing the cause of arms or letters. The mention, however, of Pedro's imprisonment that has been imposed by the king, together with the sombre wording of the initial stanza, suggest otherwise. In an article on Gómez Manrique's dialogues with other poets Daniela Capra considers that this one, unlike most of his other exchanges, reveals 'una actitud paródica y satírica' (Capra 1992: 193). More than this, however, I would argue that Gómez Manrique, in using the framework of a conventional *pregunta*, specifically parodies the courtly love lyric while expressing his concern for Pedro's situation and his distaste for the gaoler. For his part, Pedro echoes the tone set by Gómez Manrique, agreeing that they live in difficult times and declaring that where love is concerned he will continue to follow 'la vida honesta' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 236, l. 13). He echoes the tone of the courtly love lyric introduced by Gómez Manrique when, indulging in considerable hyperbole, he tells him that he 'estar en cárçel d'azero / vn año, señor, más quiero, / que amando penar vn día' (ll. 30-32) and concludes by saying that he has lost all hope. Kenneth Scholberg

²⁶ This exchange between Gómez Manrique and Pedro de Mendoza is found in two manuscripts, MN24 and MP2, both of which reverse what seems to be the logical order of the second and third stanzas of Pedro de Mendoza's reply.

comments on this poem, saying that it shows how ‘el modo de pensar estaba influido, incluso en la vida sentimental, por los hechos políticos’ (Scholberg 1971: 246n). I would argue, however, that in this instance political life is uppermost in the minds of the two poets and that their manner of expressing their concerns is influenced by the conventions of the courtly lyric that they both knew.

Exchanges between Gómez Manrique and Other Poets

We cannot date these exchanges but it seems likely that some were written when Gómez Manrique was still a young man as several concern the topic of courtly love. The poet known as Guevara, for example, asks in one piece, ‘Señor de sabia cordura’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 241-243), which is worse: ‘amor’ or ‘mal de muerte’ (ll. 12-13) and in another, ‘A vosotros los galantes’ (261), Gómez Manrique asks him which quality is preferable in a woman: ‘discreción y bien hablar, / o syn graçia hermosura’ (ll. 13-14). There are two other dialogues on the subject of love, one with the conde de Treviño (220-221), a brother of Gómez Manrique, and another with Juan Hurtado (228-230). In an exchange with Francisco Bocanegra the two men complain of their love-sickness (177-181), Gómez Manrique asking whether it is better to see a woman without being able to speak to her, or to speak to her without hope of seeing her again (178, ll. 25-32). When Gómez Manrique tells Sancho de Rojas that he cannot decide whether to return to see a lady for whom he is pining (262-264) he receives encouragement to do so (264). In another poem addressed to Diego de Rojas he asks whether he prefers a woman who is ugly but graceful, or one who is beautiful but stupid (215-216). He receives a reply that breaks free from the courtly code: ‘a la fea, mal de teta / mate y mala saeta; / reniego de su bondad’ (217, ll. 28-30). Diego de Saldaña asks Gómez Manrique’s advice about competing with his master in courting a lady (217-219) and receives a reply (219-220) telling him not to entertain such an idea. A poem of twelve lines by Diego de Benavides (189-190) to a lady on the pain of parting from her receives a jocular reply written on her behalf by Gómez Manrique (190).

Diego del Castillo, in a poem of three *octavas of arte mayor* (237-239), poses a riddle, asking who are the ‘feroçes conpañas’ who ‘nos dan por engaño muy dulce seruizio’ (ll. 17&22). Gómez Manrique replies: ‘Abejas las nonbran en nuestras Españas’ (240, l. 17). In more serious mood, Francisco de Miranda asks what the difference is between ‘miedo’ and ‘pavor’ and ‘recelo’ and ‘temor’ (212-213), to which he receives the barely satisfactory answer that it is a question of ‘poruenir e presençia’ (214, l. 32). The Portuguese poet, Álvaro Brito Pestana, asks a very different question in

his native language: who is the nobler, the man knighted before a battle or the one who receives this recognition after distinguishing himself in combat (230-231). Gómez Manrique replies in Portuguese that it is the first of the two who is more deserving (232, ll. 23-27).

On a legal issue, Fernando de Ludueña petitions Gómez Manrique, as *corregidor*, to free a relative from prison who had been convicted of gambling (266-267). The reply (267-268) grants a pardon on the grounds of Ludueña's merits as a versifier. Gómez Manrique also praises Ludueña's poetic talent elsewhere, perhaps alluding to his long poem, the *Doctrinal de la gentileza*, in 'Commo abiuan al neblí' (269-270), and declares that although he finds composition hard, he feels he must strive for perfection or remain silent. In another poem to Ludueña, 'Los aliuios que sentí' (272-273), he uses a nautical metaphor to express a loss of confidence in his own work when reading that of his friend: 'en aquella fonda mar / de vuestras trobas fundadas / con que mi fusta cluxía / que commo ya no surgía, / tiene las tablas quebradas' (ll. 4-9).

The Carrillo Circle

At some point after the death of the marqués de Santillana in 1458 Gómez Manrique joined the household of the archbishop of Toledo, Alfonso Carrillo de Acuña, to head his private army. Carrillo was an immensely wealthy man who was also very involved in the political struggles of Castile and was fervently opposed to Enrique IV, partly due to the latter's appointment of men considered unsuitable for the important posts they came to occupy.²⁷

As archbishop of Toledo, a city much afflicted with religious tensions, Carrillo also had an important role to play in trying to establish and maintain peace there and he is generally considered to have held an inclusive and Pauline attitude towards those of Jewish origin who converted to Christianity, unlike many Old Christians who resented the success of many *conversos* and were often suspicious about the sincerity of their conversion. According to the historian, Fray José de Sigüenza, Carrillo was a close associate of Alonso de Oropesa who became general of the Hieronymite order and had been moved to support New Christians following the riots in Toledo in 1449. In 1460 he was approached by some Franciscans who were concerned about Judaizers and their influence on the Christian community. Together they consorted with Enrique IV and it was decided that Oropesa would supervise an inquisition in the diocese of Toledo,

²⁷ Gómez Manrique shows his appreciation of Carrillo by addressing five *décimas* of *estrenas* to him on the occasion of a religious holiday (310-312).

something that Carrillo approved of but in which he declined to participate (Sigüenza 1907-1909: III, 363). The conclusions that Oropesa drew and his opinions on the problems between Old and New Christians are the subject of a book that he had started to write in the early 1450s and was subsequently persuaded to finish after he had completed his inquisition. This book bears the title *Lumen ad revelationem gentium et gloria plebis Israel* and is dedicated to Carrillo. In the opening dedicatory pages in which he summarizes the salient points of his book, Oropesa stresses the need for charity above all: 'la caridad es el estandarte propio de la religión cristiana por la que se reconocen los discípulos de Cristo' (Oropesa 1979: 61). He makes frequent references to Saint Paul, who reminds us that there is no difference between Jew and Greek, that all baptised Christians are one body united in Christ. He recalls a time when certain members of his order stirred up trouble and dissension by their attitude towards *conversos*: 'comenzaron a apremiar a los convertidos del judaísmo diciendo que no se los podía recibir a los honores y dignidades del pueblo de Dios en igualdad con los que se habían convertido de la gentilidad' (62). The purpose of his book, Oropesa says, is to fight 'contra la ignorancia de algunos fieles que vinieron de la gentilidad a la fe de Cristo, para hacerles ver más claro que todos nosotros, junto con aquellos que ingresaron a la Iglesia de Cristo desde el judaísmo, hemos de ser un solo pueblo en todo íntegro y perfecto, y unido en la fe en la caridad sin disparidad alguna' (76-77).

In fifteenth-century Castile this appears an enlightened attitude, but a further study of the work reveals that Oropesa had no wish to encourage the *convivencia* that had existed in previous centuries in the Iberian peninsula. In fact his tolerance is limited to those who have embraced Christianity and he is aware of the dangers that the faithful are exposing themselves to when they have contact with Jews who continue to practise their faith. He quotes St Peter in the Acts of the Apostles as support for the banning of contact with the Jews: 'De aquí viene el que la Iglesia haya prohibido tan severamente a sus fieles que convivan con ellos, coman o beban; o que intentaran recibir medicinas de ello' (264). He disapproves of Jews holding public office under which they would have authority over Christians and thinks it particularly important that the newly converted should be kept away from practising Jews: 'Por tanto no debe haber contacto alguno de los judíos que han convertido a la fe con aquellos que todavía permanecen en sus antiguos ritos' (265).

What is striking about the men whom Carrillo gathered around him is that so many of them were New Christians, with the exception of Francisco de Noya, and possibly, of Pero Guillén de Segovia. A number of them were men of letters and a

literary circle came into being which followed on from that of the marqués de Santillana. The group attracted the attention of the chronicler Fernando del Pulgar who referred to its members as ‘omes de facción’ (Pulgar 1971: 62). One of the members of this circle was Pero Díaz de Toledo who had been chaplain to the marqués. Others associated included Juan Álvarez Gato, Pero Guillén de Segovia, Juan de Mazuela, Francisco de Noya, Rodrigo Cota, Juan de Valladolid and Antón de Montoro, all of whom except for Montoro exchanged verses with Gómez Manrique, but were not necessarily members of the archbishop’s household. Montoro and Gómez Manrique were certainly aware of each other, as Montoro responded to Gómez Manrique’s *Esclamación y querella de la gouernación*, and one of Gómez Manrique’s replies to Juan de Valladolid is written ‘en nombre del Ropero’ (Gómez Manrique: 2003, 341). In the case of Juan de Valladolid and Antón de Montoro their relationship with the circle was probably more tenuous and they are described by Carlos Moreno Hernández as ‘bufones conversos más o menos esporádicos’ (Moreno Hernández 1985: 46). Their verse dialogues with Gómez Manrique cover a number of topics, ranging across moral issues, the nature of nobility, the current political climate, the writing of poetry, and questions about love. Some of these dialogues involve only Gómez Manrique and one other poet, whereas the subject of writing poetry elicits two replies and that of nobility three, I shall classify these poems according to the subjects raised, at the same time giving some biographical details of the poets concerned.

Dialogues with Juan de Mazuela on Love, Friendship and a Theological Question

Gómez Manrique exchanged several poems with Juan de Mazuela, a New Christian from Burgos who was probably born around 1415. He is known to have accompanied Alonso de Cartagena to the Council of Basel from 1434 to 1439 and at some time later became a priest and prior of the Hieronymite monastery of Santa María del Paso in Madrid. Diego de Valera tells us that Mazuela heard Enrique IV’s final confession before he died in 1474 (Valera 1941,). The subject matter of their poetic exchanges is varied and one of them initiated by Gómez Manrique, consisting of three *décimas* and a *fyn* of four lines, is a request for consolation. He is suffering from unrequited love and knows that Juan has had a similar experience (Gómez Manrique 2003: 186-187). Juan replies in the same metrical pattern, using the conventional metaphor of the fire of passion to describe his love: ‘vo pensando / en el fuego en que me quemo, / el qual yo nunca sentí / tan quemando / en grado tanto supremo’ (188, ll. 2-6). The consolation that he offers is to urge his friend not to give up his suit as he will

gain his reward in time, while at the same time he advises him to hide his true sentiments in the final four lines of the poem. Another exchange (184-186), in five *octavas*, is written like a conversation, alternating between Gómez Manrique and his friend. The former suggests that time spent in idleness is wasted and is therefore moved to write a poem to keep himself occupied. Mazuela agrees with this sentiment but his invitation to Gómez Manrique to start a composition only elicits a response to the effect that he has lost the motivation to do so. His excuse is: ‘que mis dolores extremos / an quebrantado los remos / de mi menguado aluedrío’ (ll. 28-30), which receives a reply from Mazuela suggesting that they should end this game because both of them are suffering the effects of ‘vn constante amorío’ (l. 40).

Another poem by Gómez Manrique, ‘Quexarme quiero de vos’ (203-204), is addressed to Mazuela complaining that he has had no news of his friend since he last saw him despite the expressions of sadness when they bade each other farewell. The tone of these five stanzas is familiar and contains a number of refrains, such as ‘lexos de ojos, / tan lexos de corazón’ (ll. 19-20), which suggests that the two men were close. In the final verse Gómez Manrique admits to having written in a register little suited to that of a courtier, but makes the excuse that he is living in the country, perhaps because he was engaged in a military campaign at the time. He reminds his friend that he has been a courtier in his time: ‘Avnque vivo en el aldea / e fablo como aldeano / ya yo me vi palançiano’ (ll. 33-35).

A dialogue consisting of six nine-line verses (181-184), in which the two poets again compose alternating stanzas was written when Mazuela was staying at a religious community, since the rubric reads ‘A Johan de Maçuela que posaua en vn monesterio’ and in the fifth verse there is an allusion to ‘las del velo’ (l. 41), intimating that in fact this was a convent. Gómez Manrique begins the sequence by expressing regret that his friend is staying there, since he feels that no good or ‘mal recaudo’ (l. 9) will come of it, but Mazuela chooses to disagree with his friend. His answer hints that Gómez Manrique is not fully apprised of the situation: ‘de lo que pensáys / que no me siento nin duelo / en ello vos no cayáys (ll. 16-18). Gómez Manrique’s response to this is to express the feeling that his friend is on a different plane and, when they come together to pray, he observes: ‘fállovos que no llegáys / mala bez los pies al suelo’ (ll. 25-26). Mazuela stands his ground and assures his friend that they still have much in common: ‘yo rezo como rezáys, / e pesco con el anzuelo / mesmo con que vos pescáys’ (ll. 34-36). The use of the word ‘anzuelo’ appears to be used figuratively here, suggesting that in fact Mazuela was pursuing one of the nuns in the convent. In the next stanza Gómez

Manrique alludes to Mazuela's frequent conversations with the female inmates (l. 42); his friend is surprised to have been found out so soon.

Finally, another dialogue between these two men, presumably written when Mazuela had embraced the religious life, is in a more serious vein. This exchange initiated by Gómez Manrique, a demonstration of his interest in theological matters, is a reflection of *devotio moderna*, a religious movement that originated in northern Europe and whose influence came to be felt in Spain. Devotional literature had begun to be produced in the vernacular, making it accessible to a wider readership; an example of this is Pérez de Ayala's translation of the book of Job and Saint Gregory's *Moralia* into Spanish. Francisco López Estrada describes the movement as 'una corriente que pretende revisar la devoción y la piedad, con el objeto de hacerlas más vivas, con una mayor participación y conciencia del hecho religioso, sobre todo en el orden personal y subjetivo' (López Estrada 1979: 503).

In the poem of three *octavas*, 'Pues vos vi sienpre maestro' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 221-222) Gómez Manrique questions his friend on two points. Firstly he asks if Jesus would have been incarnate if Adam had not sinned and secondly, if man's redemption depended upon Jesus's death. Mazuela's reply (222-223) does not in fact answer Gómez Manrique's initial question, but assumes that he realizes that Adam's transgression was passed on to all mankind when he states, 'por quanto Adán erró, / al señor le conuinió / mostrarnos acá su cara' (ll. 18-20). In answering this question Mazuela may have had Saint Paul's epistle to the Romans in mind: 'For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous' (Romans, 5, 19). The necessity of sacrifice to gain forgiveness is also stressed by Paul in his letter to the Hebrews when he says, 'And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission' (Hebrews, 9, 22).

Two Dialogues with Juan Álvarez Gato, One Concerning the Courtly Code and Another on a Moral Issue

Juan Álvarez Gato, a *converso* like Mazuela, also participated in several verse dialogues with Gómez Manrique. He is reputed to have been knighted by Juan II who died in 1454 and, since he would not have been knighted much before the age of twenty years, he was probably born around 1435 (Pescador del Hoyo 1972: 306-307). Early on in his career he served in the household of the Mendozas of Guadalajara and then, as a protégé of Beltrán de la Cueva, who was also a *converso*, he served Enrique IV. In

1466, however, he was moved to leave the king's service when Enrique IV connived with Juan Pacheco in an attempt to assassinate Pedro Arias Dávila, also known as Pedrarias. The latter survived the attack and Álvarez Gato subsequently entered the service of the Arias Dávila family (Márquez Villanueva 1960: 19). This incident no doubt brought him closer to the Carrillo circle who were united in their opposition to Enrique, and Francisco Márquez Villanueva points to evidence that he very probably became a member of Carrillo's household, quoting from a poem written for Alfonso Carrillo by Álvarez Gato 'en nombre de todos de su casa' (25). In line 9 of this poem he names a number of men serving Carrillo including 'los Aluarez, amos que aqui estan presente' (Álvarez Gato 1928: 125). Álvarez Gato later became *mayordomo* to Isabel I and was a friend of fray Hernando de Talavera, also of *converso* stock, who was confessor to Isabel and later, as archbishop of Granada, opposed the establishment of the Inquisition.

Three verse exchanges between Gómez Manrique and Juan Álvarez Gato are known. One sequence of four poems, each of two stanzas of *octavas*, is initiated by Gómez Manrique and bears the rubric 'Gómez Manrique a Juan Álvarez, auiéndole loado mucho vna señora de las de Guadalajara' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 274). This is a playful dialogue in which Gómez Manrique makes a point of keeping to the code of courtly conduct and not disclosing which of the ladies of Guadalajara he is writing about. It is sufficient, he says, to give his friend 'el vn cabo dell ouillo / para que lo devanés' (ll. 12-13), 'ouillo' in this context meaning a skein of wool, a metaphor for a mystery to be solved. Álvarez Gato in his reply, thinking that he has guessed the identity of the lady, warns him of the suffering he may encounter in courting her: 'Mas quiero, señor, nenbraros / c'os herís con un cuchillo / que ni temerá mataros / ni reçela d'omezillo' (275, ll. 9-12). In his second poem of this sequence (276) Gómez Manrique shows that he is aware of his friend's desire to guess the identity of the woman and extends the metaphor of the 'ouillo', declaring that 'ya las cuerdas de mis tiendas / nunca las arrancarés' (ll. 15-16) or in other words, he will not be able to unravel the skein of wool. Álvarez Gato replies, promising not to reveal her identity although he thinks that he knows it and advises his friend against following 'los caminos y las sendas / por do sé c'os perderés' (ll. 15-16).

Another dialogue is of a less frivolous nature. In 'De vos, varón adornado' (278) Gómez Manrique begins by complimenting Álvarez Gato on his poetic skills by saying, 'en esta ciençia [...] que habláys perlas y plata' (ll. 3&5) and then asks, in a poem of one ten-line stanza and a *cabo* of equal length, '¿quáles males pueden ser / que nos

pueden bien hazer, / y bienes que hagan mal?’ (ll. 8-10). In the *cabo* he appears to be taking a moral stand, or at least paying lip-service to one, by pointing out that many people state that poverty and adversity should be seen in a positive light and yet they expose themselves to danger as they seek prosperity, thus making themselves guilty of muddled thinking, or perhaps of hypocrisy.

Álvarez Gato’s response of three stanzas, ‘Dino de más memorado’ (279-280) to Gómez Manrique’s two, suggests that the latter may have originally written another verse which has been lost. Álvarez Gato begins by reciprocating the compliments that Gómez Manrique has paid him. The second half of the first stanza reads: ‘Males son bien y creçer / que son por lo diuinal; / el bien qu’es mal y perder / es el que vino a caber / en quien no busca lo tal’ (ll. 6-10), five lines whose obscurity may well be due to the constraints placed upon the poet to reply using the same rhyme scheme. The first two lines of this quotation appear to mean that what may seem to be adversity can grow into something good when it is divinely ordained, the implication being that suffering is good for the soul. In the final three lines of this stanza Álvarez Gato declares that an acquisition considered as something good is in fact a loss when it is not sought. The reasoning behind this statement is again obscure, but it seems to mean that those who benefit from wealth and privilege, which they have acquired with no effort, should not necessarily be considered truly fortunate. The reference in the first two lines of the second stanza to ‘los sabios que loaron / las pequeñas facultades’ suggests that Álvarez Gato thinks the wise are often in a minority and, together with those who do not conform to accepted opinions, have different views on the motivations or ‘voluntades’ (l. 15) that make men act as they do. Returning to the question of what is good and bad, he reflects that shrewd people did not fear misfortune and or even regard it as such: ‘ni temieron las caýdas / ny las tomaron a veras’ (ll. 17-18), taking the Stoics’ attitude that virtue has its own reward: ‘esforçando las vanderas / de las virtuosas vidas’ (ll. 19-20). The use of the past tense here should be noted: although it may have been used to mirror the rhyme scheme of Gómez Manrique’s verses, it also reflects the topos of regret for past times when people displayed a greater moral integrity.

In his *Cabo* he flatters Gómez Manrique, remarking that it is folly for him to exchange verses with him, as it is ‘como llevar agua al río / y pescados a la mar’ (ll. 24-25), and in the final lines of this verse he also makes an appeal to his interlocutor: ‘Vos, señor de noble seno, / sanead tal entrevalo, / pues tenés poder tan lleno, / que harés de malo bueno / como yo de bueno malo’ (ll. 26-30). Taking into account the subsequent lines, his use of the word ‘noble’ here doubtless refers not to Gómez Manrique’s

aristocratic lineage but to his innate character, and the imperative ‘sanead’, here used figuratively to mean ‘to cleanse’ or ‘to purge’, reveals a confidence in his ability to use his influence for the good of society. The use of the word ‘entrevalo’, again used in its abstract sense, signifies the gulf that exists between those ‘personas arteras’ referred to in the second stanza and the others who are not guided by the same Stoic principles which embraced the belief that virtue is its own reward.²⁸ Álvarez Gato is therefore taking an uncompromisingly moral stand in his reply to what appears to have been an open question on the part of Gómez Manrique with no obviously moral agenda. This preoccupation on the part of the Carrillo circle with questions on moral issues arises again in an exchange between Pero Guillén de Segovia and Gómez Manrique.

Two Dialogues with Pero Guillén de Segovia, One on Feelings of Vulnerability and Another on the Source of Virtue

Pero Guillén de Segovia, who exchanged more verses with Gómez Manrique than any other poet, was born in 1413 and became *contador* to the archbishop in 1463. He was taken into Carrillo’s household after suffering ten difficult years, possibly for having shown support for Álvaro de Luna. In the prose prologue to one of his poems he refers to the hard times he experienced when he says, ‘por industria me levanté del suelo donde ya los menudos del pueblo me refollaban poniéndome a las lanzas de todos’ (Guillén de Segovia 1985: 135, accents added). Moreno Hernández writes that Américo Castro explains that the ‘menudos del pueblo’ are the Old Christians who were responsible for the persecution suffered by so many New Christians and Jews in the fifteenth century (Moreno Hernández 1985: 28).

Guillén’s *preguntas* addressed to Gómez Manrique are always of a serious nature and it is on the subject of virtue that he initiates an exchange with Gómez Manrique (249-251), addressing him as ‘vn maestro en teología’ in the rubric. In this poem, ‘Sy el comienço de la cosa’, he asks firstly what it is that produces virtue, whether this is an innate quality or something acquired: ‘sy es obra de natura / o curso que nos procura / la perfeta beatitud’ (ll. 7-9). In the second stanza he asks what prevents many people from acting in a moral way; whether the impediment to good behaviour is something that has always existed or if it only arises in times of corruption. Pero Guillén develops these reflections in the third verse when he considers the manifestations of human weakness and poses several questions all of which show an

²⁸ Covarrubias’s dictionary gives the following definition of ‘entrevalo’: ‘el impedimento o espacio que ay de un lugar a otro, o de un tiempo a otro’.

underlying concern for sincerity. The fourth verse refers to ‘aquellos tres enemigos’ (l. 30), presumably, the world, the flesh and the devil with the question as to whether it is possible to save ourselves. In the *fyn* he makes a comparison between human behaviour and the navigation of a ship, asking, ‘Quál será la bitüalla / para que bien naveguemos’ (ll. 37-38).

Gómez Manrique replies in ‘Es hazaña virtuosa’ (251-252) to the first question by saying that virtue is something acquired by habit and is refined over a long period of time. In answer to the second question he sees temptation as a battle between human frailty and the seven deadly sins which he expresses in military terms: ‘Los syete viçios valientes / con humanas tentaçiones / a desplegadas pendones / son los duros combatientes’ (ll. 10-13). In the fourth stanza he reflects that temptations appear to us ‘con ábitos de amigos’ (l. 30) and are not to be overcome by physical force, but by will-power: ‘no de fuste nin de malla / converná que nos armemos, / mas a la carne sobrala’ (ll. 32-34). His allusion to ‘los otros dos’ in the final line of this verse may refer to the world and the devil which will be overcome once the ‘la carne’ has been beaten. The metaphor of the navigation of a ship in the *fyn* mirrors that of Pero Guillén when he states that we must not nourish ourselves with the ‘pan de la canalla’ (l. 37), presumably meaning ill-gotten gains, and that our ship must not carry any bad cargo: we must live our lives with integrity.

Pero Guillén, despite having achieved a post in Carrillo’s household, reveals a deep sense of insecurity regarding the society in which he lives in a *pregunta* addressed to Gómez Manrique. The poem ‘Nauegando los extremos’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 246-247) consists of four *octavas* and a *fin* of four lines. It contains a variety of metaphors, in the first of which the poet sees his position as the commander of a fleet of ships steering his vessels through distant waters and who is vulnerable to attacks from pirates. The allusion to ‘bateles voluntarios’ (l. 2) suggests that he has chosen what could be a dangerous course of action rather than having been forced into it. In such a situation the ships must not be allowed to drift : ‘yerro es soltar los remos’ (l. 3) and in deep water and with an unfavourable wind, the oars are ‘petrechos nesçesarios’ (l. 8). The first quatrain of the second verse refers to new laws being imposed by those who ‘caçan con buharro’ (l. 10), a hunting metaphor which likens those in authority to a hawk seeking out its prey, further heightening the poet’s sense of insecurity. In the second quatrain Pero Guillén returns to his metaphor of steering his ships, regretting that although he moors them in the most secure of havens, they are not completely safe: ‘fengidos ayres no puros / las manzillan con su barro’ (ll. 15-16). The third stanza

defines those ‘fengidos ayres’ suggesting that Pero Guillén sees much duplicity in the world around him; he reflects that those who speak openly are more supportive: ‘mayor faze su partido / quien lo secreto reuela’ (ll. 19-20). The second half of this stanza suggests an analogy with actors who are inconsistent in their style of speaking and there is a play on words when Pero Guillén remarks that these actors, ‘nin juntan filo con filo, / tanto rota va la tela’ (ll. 23-24). The ‘tela’ is the subject-matter of their speech, but it also has the meaning of ‘fabric’ or ‘textile’: here the implication is that the fabric has become so worn that it is impossible to mend it and fuse the broken threads, just as those in positions of power are inconsistent in their utterances. In the fourth verse Pero Guillén expresses dismay because he is unable to assess how his life will progress, but one thing that he feels sure of is that without good fortune virtue and diligence go unrewarded. This thought is echoed in the *Fin* when he writes, ‘Non es bien fazer manida / en fuzia de la Fortuna, / nin es natural laguna / la que finche el abenida’ (ll.31-35).

Gómez Manrique’s reply to this poem (248-249) offers little comfort to Pero Guillén and is expressed in a forthright manner. He concurs with him as he responds to the points made in each stanza, admitting that they live in dangerous times and that it is difficult to protect themselves from their enemies. Rather than using the same metaphor of the ship being steered through dangerous waters, used by Pero Guillén, he employs the imagery of the battlefield to express the hostility that he feels around him. Their enemies are ‘sagitarios’ (l. 2) concealed in the ‘frondas’ (l. 6) and who cannot be reached with the standard weaponry of ‘las fondas / con cordeles hordinarios’ (ll. 7-8). In the second verse, responding to Pero Guillén’s thoughts about safety, he reflects that those of humble birth fare better in guarding their flocks than kings who engage in warfare. He recalls having seen ‘vn rey nauarro’ (l. 13), presumably Juan II, who would rather have abandoned politics and followed the tenets of Epicureanism, dressed as a peasant in a sheepskin or ‘çamarro’ (l. 16) than continue fighting a difficult battle. In the third verse he remarks that there is no point in losing any sleep in such a corrupt world since those who have risen the highest fear their own downfall most, which is a way of telling Pero Guillén that he has less to fear in his situation than others who have climbed higher in the world. In answer to the dismay expressed in Pero Guillén’s fourth stanza, Gómez Manrique suggests that holding out hopes for the distant future only inflicts more pain: ‘faze llaga dolorida’ (l. 26). He ends this verse by stating that ‘firmeza’, which might be translated as ‘moral steadfastness’, is a rule that applies to everyone and yet it is seldom rewarded. In the *Fin*, rather than alluding to Fortune, Gómez Manrique

only emphasizes the fear that is felt by all in positions of power when he says, ‘que debaxo de la luna / non sé tan firme coluna / que non tema su cayóda’ (ll. 34-36).

Pero Guillén de Segovia and Juan Álvarez Gato on Writing Poetry

In another exchange it is Gómez Manrique who initiates the dialogue with Pero Guillén, sending him a poem of three nine-line stanzas, ‘Tanto ha que no trobé’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 223-225), in which he complains of the difficulty of verse composition: since he has not tried to write any verses for a long time he has lost the necessary skill. His use of concrete images in the three metaphors of this poem is interesting because it suggests that he sees writing poetry more as a practical craft rather than an abstract, intellectual activity. In the first stanza he imparts a sense of the struggle he is experiencing by saying that his efforts feel like engaging in combat with weapons that have become rusty through disuse. The result of this is that he finds it difficult to express any subtlety of thought and cannot resort to models found in well-known works: ‘Las discreçiones remotas / no sufren obras fundadas’ (ll. 8-9). In the second verse he uses a hunting image, drawing an analogy between the poet faced with the difficulties of poetic composition and the hawk that has lost its vital feathers, ‘los cuchillos’ (l. 11), that it needs in order to fly. He continues by again likening verse composition to a craft which requires the right tools, just as an artisan such as a blacksmith needs a hammer that is not broken in order to do his job. He finds it hard to produce any verse that is sufficiently polished and expresses his dissatisfaction with his efforts, suggesting that he will give up writing about matters of importance: ‘Pues fallo botas las limas, / y las otras herramientas / maltractadas, orinientas / dexaré las obras primas’ (ll. 16-19). The third stanza, still more self-critical in tone, indicates again that he is struggling to write in verse when he refers to his script as ‘estos pocos renglones / llenos de hartos borrones’ (ll. 21-22) and ends with two questions. In the first he wants to know ‘quándo congela Borea / lo que Austro desbarata’ (ll. 24-25), intimating that the north wind or ‘Borea’ is a force that will help him to crystalize his thoughts from the chaos that has resulted from the influence of ‘Austro’, the warm wind from the south. The second question, in the two final lines, is despairing in tone when he asks why an ugly woman should look at herself in a mirror, thus making this comparison with himself as he considers his own unsatisfactory attempts at writing poetry, and questioning why he should continue with his efforts.

Pero Guillén’s response, ‘Yo que syempre reproué’ (225-226), in this instance is forthright and in the opening lines of his reply he gives the impression that he senses a

certain false modesty on the part of his interlocutor to which he takes exception: ‘Yo que siempre reproué / lo que fengido syntiese’. He is of the opinion that once learned, the art of writing poetry is not forgotten, just as things that we learned long ago remain hidden in the deepest recesses of our memory or, as he puts it, ‘cubiertas de gruesas motas’ (l. 7). In the second verse of his reply Pero Guillén offers encouragement, saying that the wise do not fear rivalry since any laurels they have gained will not wither. It is acceptable in the competitive ambience of the court that there should be tussles which he compares with the swordsmanship that men of Gómez Manrique’s class would all practise: ‘Y consienten las esgrimas / las espadas ser humientas’ (ll. 15-16), thus using a similar type of imagery to that used in the poem to which he is replying. The third and final stanza offers more reassurance and alludes to Gómez Manrique’s mention of the North and South winds and their effect in his original poem. He develops this idea by reasoning that although the north wind does its work in winter, the succession of the seasons will not change, and therefore, just as ‘la fea’ can improve her appearance when she takes a look at herself, he implies that a time will come when Gómez Manrique too will be able to flourish again as a poet.

When Álvarez Gato adds a reply of his own to this exchange (227-228) and confesses in his first verse to having had the same problems with poetic composition, he says that the more he tried, the harder it was. In the second verse he turns his attention to Gómez Manrique and flatters him by calling him ‘el gran orador’ (l. 10) and claiming that all others in comparison were mere ‘grillos’ (l. 11) who learn from him: ‘çeváys a nuestro sabor / a los engeños çenzillos’ (ll. 13-14). Continuing his flattery, Álvarez Gato uses a different, but traditional, metaphor to contrast their abilities: ‘que las hondas y altas simas / de las mares muy hiruienyas / como temen las tormentas, / asý hazen las estimas’ (ll. 15-18). In other words, writing poetry can be compared with sailing over a stormy sea with success being equated with riding the crest of the waves. The nautical metaphor used in connection with poetic composition can be traced from classical writers: Ernst Curtius cites Virgil, Horace and Pliny amongst others who used it and comments, ‘This class of metaphor is extraordinarily widespread throughout the Middle Ages and long survives into later times’ (Curtius 1979: 128-129). In the third stanza he recalls Gómez Manrique’s comparison between his progress, or lack of it, in his writing and the arrival of the north or south winds, but he sends a positive message. The winds are seasonal and when Acario, the warm wind of summer, is no longer so strong, the north wind makes its presence felt and enables the poet to achieve what he wants, just as the ugly woman, when she looks at herself in the mirror, is able to achieve what she

wants. In fact neither Pero Guillén nor Álvarez Gato make any constructive comments to Gómez Manrique on the difficulties of verse composition and their responses appear to reveal a desire to flatter and cement their relationship with him.

The Subject of Nobility in Fifteenth-Century Spain with Particular Reference to Diego de Valera

Another question Gómez Manrique raises in this type of poem is that of the origins of nobility, which we find in his *pregunta* addressed to Francisco de Noya, ‘No teniendo del saber’ (253-255). Not only did Francisco reply, but so did Rodrigo Cota and Pero Guillén de Segovia.

The fact that the original *pregunta* on this subject attracted three replies reflects that this was not just an issue that preoccupied those who were dissatisfied with the way in which Enrique IV hastened to ennoble many of his favourites, but a topic that had already preoccupied a number of fifteenth-century writers. One such writer was Alonso de Cartagena who in 1436 produced a *Discurso* in which he asserted that true virtue and honour were attributes that came from an individual’s character irrespective of their ancestry or social background. Gregory Kaplan thinks that this work had considerable influence on other writers and observes, ‘Cartagena’s posture in the *Discurso* [...] did not take long to affect the ideology of contemporary *converso* prose. In the *Espejo de verdadera nobleza*, composed only a few years after the *Discurso* (most likely in 1441), Mosén Diego de Valera echoed Cartagena’s conception of virtue and honour’ (Kaplan 1996: 55). Diego de Valera was the son of a *converso* physician, born in 1412, and therefore an exact contemporary of Gómez Manrique. He entered the service of Juan II in 1427 at age of fifteen as member of the Orden de los Donceles which had a military role and took part in the battle of Higuera in 1431. He was armed as a knight in 1435 and acquired the title of Mosén in 1437. He travelled extensively in France and Bohemia on diplomatic missions for Juan II but was not afraid to oppose the king’s favourite, Álvaro de Luna, and played a part in his downfall (Rodríguez Velasco 1996: 213-237). Although there is no evidence that Valera and Gómez Manrique ever corresponded with each other, as courtiers it was likely that they had contact, and the inventory of Gómez Manrique’s library reveals that he had in his possession a volume listed as ‘Uno pequeño de Mosen Diego de Valera’ (Gómez Manrique 1875-1876: II, 333). This book could have been the *Defensa de las mujeres*, but it might also have been another short tract, *Espejo de verdadera nobleza*, dedicated to Juan II, and perhaps written after Valera’s return from his travels in Europe in 1438 (Rodríguez Velasco

1996: 223), although Michael Gerli suggests that it was written a decade later (Gerli, 1996: 23).

In the first of the eleven chapters of his treatise Valera seeks to define nobility and looks to writers such as Aristotle, Dante, Boccaccio and the fourteenth-century Italian jurist, Bartolo da Sassoferrato. The first definition, supported by Aristotle and Boccaccio, is that ‘antiguas riquezas y heredamientos fazen al onbre noble’ (Valera 1959: 90). Secondly he refers to Boethius, Seneca and a number of the Church Fathers who think that ‘antiguas buenas costumbres fazen al onbre noble, no curando de riqueza’ and that these habits must be sustained over a long period of time for the person to be considered noble. Thirdly, nobility is thought by some to derive from valiant parents and grandparents. Valera has never seen this last opinion in any written form, but declares that it is a view commonly held by ‘gente vulgar’ (91). Sassoferrato, however, disagrees with all three definitions and thinks that there are three different kinds of nobility: theological, natural and civil and it is on the latter that Valera concentrates his thoughts.

In his fourth chapter Valera defines this third category of nobility: ‘La tercera nobleza es civil o política, por la qual es fecha cierta diferencia entre el noble y el plebeo (92). He emphasizes Sassoferrato’s insistence on both the divine and legal nature of the monarch’s rule: ‘Ca los príncipes tienen el lugar de Dios en la tierra, e la ley tiene el lugar del príncipe’ (92), subsequently quoting his definition of nobility as ‘una calidad dada por el príncipe, por la qual alguno parece ser más acepto allende los otros onestos plebeos’ (92-93). Honour of this sort conferred by the prince must be deserved and Valera quotes Aristotle on the subject of the prince who ennoble the undeserving: ‘El príncipe que da a los indignos muy pequeño loor gana; e el que da a los indignos, pierde lo que da e peca mortalmente’ (93). He adds a truly Stoic sentiment when he reminds us that, no matter what honours are conferred on an individual, virtue is its own reward, as Seneca said, ‘el fruto de las buenas obras es averlas fecho’ (94). At the end of this chapter Valera emphasizes the role of the prince, declaring that Sassoferrato is convinced that even if a man were to live virtuously for a thousand years, he would still be a plebeian if not ennobled by the prince (94).

These thoughts lead Valera to reflect in his next chapter upon the origins of civil nobility where he refers to earlier ages when men shared everything on an equal footing and then to the time when malice in the world grew and men gradually became more grasping: ‘quien pudo más ocupar quebrantando el derecho de la humanal compañía, fizo suyo lo que primero de todos era’ (95). Thus the least oppressive tyrants were held

to be the noblest and ‘los que la natura iguales crió, la malicia desiguales fizo’ (95). He backs this up with a reference to Aristotle who, he says, asserted that only virtue and malice determined who was free and who was a slave. In a reference to the story of the Tower of Babel Valera reminds us that those who spoke the same language went on to choose their leader and that those closest to the leader ‘fueron tenidos por nobles o fidalgos’ (95). Afterwards many of the strongest won power, often helped by good fortune, and the weakest remained in servitude, although some of the latter rose to power, ‘virtuosamente biviendo, otros por fuerça e tiranía e ayudándoles la fortuna’ (95). One of those who belonged to the second category was Julius Caesar whom Valera considered ‘primero de los tiranos’ (97), a man of humble birth who was helped by fortune and occupied the first imperial throne of the world. He mentions others who did likewise, rising from humble origins, such as Diocletian, who deserved his ‘soberana silla’ due to his many virtues (97). They are all examples of the origins of nobility, showing that it is possible for some ‘del polvo de la tierra ser levantados en soberanos honores’ (97).

Still following the ideas of Sassoferrato, Valera continues by saying that ‘dignidad’ and ‘nobleza’ are one and the same thing and that they are a quality that is ‘ayuntada a la persona, la qual le da alguna preheminencia’ (98). Some of those who have this ‘dignidad’ have actual titles such as duke or count, whilst others acquire their nobility from their ancestors’ reputation and retain it if they live ‘honestamente’ but lose it if they bring disgrace upon themselves (98). In a further chapter Valera refutes the common proverb ‘puede el rey fazer cauallero, mas no fijodalgo’ which he thinks is founded on ‘poco saber e ciego conoscimiento’ as the ignorant rarely respect true merit (100). Although he does not define the difference between ‘cauallero’ and ‘fijodalgo’ it can be inferred that the latter is someone who receives some recognition of his virtue; examples from the Old Testament are given of men of humble birth who were ennobled by a king, such as Joseph by Pharaoh. Valera ends this chapter by declaring that the king has the highest grade of nobility and that the closer a person is to the prince the higher his degree of nobility. There is a certain irony in this since he has expressed the opinion that those who hold the reins of power are descended originally from the more grasping elements of society or from those who were favoured by fortune, and yet he adheres to the conviction that the monarch or prince is the noblest of all.

There are some issues that Valera feels he must deal with regarding the above-mentioned chapter and one in particular is relevant in the context of discussing the poems written by *converso* members of the Carrillo circle. The question that he poses is

whether ‘los convertidos a nuestra Fe, que segunt su ley o seta eran nobles, retienen la nobleza o fidalguía después de cristianos’ (101). In answer to this he argues that not only do *conversos* retain their noble status but enhance it on conversion as they then enjoy theological nobility, something from which they were barred beforehand. He has no doubt that there are nobles who live virtuous lives amongst the Jews and the Moors and quotes Deuteronomy, 4, which speaks of the nobility of the Jewish race. Reflecting on this, Valera asks, ‘¿en quál nasción tantos nobles fallarse pueden como en la de los judíos, en la qual fueron todos los profetas, todos los patriarchas e santos padres, todos los apóstoles e finalmente nuestra bien aventurada señora Sancta María, y el su bendito fijo Dios e onbre verdadero nuestro redemptor, el qual este linaje escogió para sí por el más noble [...] e por aquellas palabras que dixo: “yo raigué en el pueblo honrrado y en los escogidos metí raíces”?’ (103). He has little sympathy for the Jews who did not recognise the divinity of Christ when he declares ‘así los judíos, por sus pecados caídos en la incredulidad de nuestro Señor, merescieron todos los males en que están, de los quales salir no pueden fasta ser por la gracia de Dios llamados’ (104). He recalls, however, that the foundations of the Christian church were laid when Jesus told Peter, himself a converted Jew, ‘Tú eres Pedro, y sobre aquesta piedra la mi Iglesia fundaré’ (105).

Valera introduces another chapter by recalling that the founders of the orders of knighthood had three considerations in mind when recruiting their members: the desire for the public good, the desire to reward virtue, and to provide the orders with worthy ministers and servants. Here the *ubi sunt* topos is much in evidence as he looks back at this time as if it was a golden age in which knights strove only to achieve noble and virtuous aims: ‘la virtud ya los avía domado; bivían libres de esperança e de miedo; su final entención era sólo de gloria e de fama’ (106). He reflects upon how different the ethos is now amongst those who seek to be knighted as they are only interested in the benefits that they may acquire, such as evading tax and gaining power and influence: ‘Ya las costumbres de cavallería en robo e tiranía son reformadas; ya no curamos cuánto virtuoso sea el cavallero, mas cuánto abundoso sea de riquezas’ (107). He is ashamed of the changes that he sees in the ranks of those who are knights: ‘En tanta contrariedad son nuestras cosas a las primeras que remenbrarlo me fase vergüença’ (107). Just as the habit does not make a monk, so gold does not make a nobleman. He thinks that the nobles should exert themselves to live virtuous lives, ‘biviendo a enxemplo de los padres primeros, que la noble orden de la cavallería más es conforme a virtud que a riqueza’ (108).

Francisco de Noya, Pero Guillén de Segovia and Rodrigo Cota Reply to Gómez Manrique's Question on Nobility and Knighthood

Perhaps it was a consequence of reading Valera's treatise that Gómez Manrique decided to address a poem of six stanzas, 'No teniendo del saber', on the subject of nobility to Francisco de Noya (Gómez Manrique 2003: 253-255) which elicits replies not just from Noya but also from Pero Guillén and Rodrigo Cota. It is as 'maestre Francisco de Noya, maestro del muy exçelente Príncipe de Castilla, Rey de Seçilia' that he is addressed by Gómez Manrique in the rubric to his *pregunta* from which we may conclude that it was written between 1469 and 1474. Gómez Manrique begins by emphasizing Noya's wisdom and knowledge, indulging in considerable hyperbole when he compares him with Virgil and Dante. A lot of this poem is taken up with Gómez Manrique declaring his ignorance and his desire to learn, and it is significant that he prefaces his fourth stanza with the lines, 'Lo que no sope leyendo, / quiero saber preguntando', which certainly suggests that he had been reading on the subject of his question.

It is not until the end of the fourth verse that we learn what his *preguntas* are. The first is 'sy ovo reyes primero / que caualleros ouiese' (ll. 31-32), a question that is at the very core of the fifth chapter of Valera's *Espejo* where he writes about the origins of civil nobility. In the following verse he observes that the king has overall power 'en las tierras' (l. 35), presumably meaning he has absolute power where material things are concerned, but asks if this same power extends to matters that are as intangible as making a man a nobleman whatever his nature and disposition: 'dezid sy puede fazer / de su poder ordinario / noble de pura nobleza / de qualquier su natural' (ll. 35-38). Those words 'de qualquier su natural' strongly suggest that Gómez Manrique sees a failure to live up to his concept of nobility on the part of some of those he has seen ennobled, together with a realization that the granting of a title is little more than an empty gesture. In the *fin* he admits to having found varying answers to this question and hopes that Noya can finally give a satisfactory reply. This *pregunta* very probably mirrors the resentment felt by many of the old aristocracy at the creation of so many noble titles during the fifteenth century, a phenomenon illustrated by Roger Boase in his study of social change in late medieval Spain, *The Troubadour Revival*. Boase shows that no fewer than sixty-five titles of nobility were granted between 1430 and 1480 (Boase 1978: 159) and the promotion of men who neither possessed the sort of pedigree enjoyed by families such as the Manriques, nor demonstrated any inherently noble characteristics, was doubtless a cause of resentment on the part of the old aristocracy.

Not a great deal is known about the early life of Francisco de Noya but, according to Vidal González, he was born probably around 1415 and received the name of Noya due to an ecclesiastical appointment in Galicia (Gómez Manrique 2003: 252n). He became tutor or *preceptor* to Fernando de Aragón in 1466 and later a canon of Girona where he was a friend of Joan Margarit who wrote a manual for the education of the young Fernando which has not survived. He was also sent on a diplomatic mission to Rome and later he held appointments in Sicily, first as archdeacon of Siracuse, and from 1484 as bishop of Cefalú.

Noya's reply to Gómez Manrique's question, 'Vuestro entero meresçer' (255-256), contains the much-used modesty topos when in the initial verse he declares himself 'commo quien syn lumbr e açierta / yré con dubda dubdosa' (ll. 7-8) where the subject of nobility is concerned. He reciprocates Gómez Manrique's flattery by praising him for his lineage, intelligence, discretion, and poetic ability, making the comparison 'vos en consejos Catón' (l. 15). His answer to the question starts in the third stanza where he takes a theological approach, recalling the fall of Adam and referring to this time as 'Después qu'el gran padre nuestro / perdió la luz de la fe' (ll. 17-18). He continues by reminding Gómez Manrique that subsequently the evil side of man's nature predominated so that mankind 'en saber fue ygualado / con las fyeras y jumentas' (ll. 23-24) and strife prevailed amongst the human race, again a thought very similar to that expressed in Valera's fifth chapter when he reminds us of the time when men lived in harmony with one another and shared everything they had. In the fourth stanza Noya makes it clear that it was the genuinely noble man or 'caballero' who forced the people to live in peace with one another, established laws and chose a ruler to defend those less able to defend themselves. The qualities needed to effect these changes, 'seso, bondat, fortaleza' (l. 37) are the stuff of nobility 'el vero valer (que) / no se da por secretario' (ll. 35-36). When demonstrated, however, they are to be rewarded with honours conferred by royalty. In his *fin* Noya admits that the state of knighthood has been established by kings, but he insists that 'primero ovo en la gente / nobleza, virtud y potença / e cauallero valiente / que no real exçelencia' (ll. 45-48), thereby stressing his belief in the difference between innate virtue and titular nobility.

The response from Pero Guillén, 'Más tenéys a mi entender' (259-260), contains much flattery of Gómez Manrique, just as the latter had flattered Noya. Not only does Pero Guillén admire Gómez Manrique for his knowledge and ability to express himself elegantly, but praises him also for his diplomacy and skill in weathering the storms that he encounters in his life. He sees him as a leader of Castile when he remarks, echoing

the words of the prophet Isaiah, ‘Soys en tanto diestro / qu’en la verga de Jesé / al que toma algún siniestro / sabéys tornar a la fe.’ (ll. 17-20). There is no doubt in the mind of Pero Guillén that true nobility is not a quality that can be conferred on anyone, as he declares in the fourth stanza of his poem: ‘y sabéys qu’el cauallero, / syn tener quien le eligiese, / vino ante y postrimero / el rey que título diese’ (ll. 29-31). To emphasize the fact that nobility is an inherent characteristic he uses a comparison: base metal cannot be transformed into anything else ‘porqu’en su primero ser / quedará de necesario’ (ll. 35-36). The opposition to Enrique IV is obvious in the fifth verse with the declaration ‘así no puede vileza / gozar de sangre real’ (ll. 37-38). The final stanza of this poem reiterates the praise of Gómez Manrique and ends on a humble note with Pero Guillén asking him to correct him if in any way he has made any omissions in his poem.

Rodrigo Cota also chose to respond to Gómez Manrique’s question about nobility in ‘Al son del dulce tañer’ (257-258). Cota, who was a *converso* from Toledo, is better known as the author of the dramatic poem *Diálogo entre el amor y un viejo* and whose name has sometimes been put forward as the author of the first act of *La Celestina*.²⁹ He also wrote a highly satirical epithalamium out of pique when not invited to the wedding of a member of the Arias Dávila family who married a Mendoza. Although the Cota family occupied important positions in Toledo they also suffered much persecution. Rodrigo’s father, Alonso, was treasurer of the city and in 1449 found himself pressurized by Álvaro de Luna into raising a tax to support Juan II’s troops against the Aragonese who had invaded Castile. When the citizens rebelled against the imposition of this tax, Alonso became a target of the citizens’ anger which was no doubt exacerbated by the fact of his ethnic origins and, although he survived, his house was burnt down (Cantera Burgos 1970: 10). Rodrigo and several members of the family were later to fall foul of the Inquisition (59-65; Kaplan 1996: 10-11).

In the initial stanza of his response (Gómez Manrique 2003: 257) Cota, like the other participants in these exchanges, assumes a certain modesty, referring to ‘mi torpe lengua’ (l. 6) as he explains that he is inspired to write his own reply. He makes a comparison between the writing of poetry and the composing of music, observing that in making music there are some people who will strike a discordant note so that their audience may hear them and this is what he is doing in writing this poem. He concurs with Noya and Guillén de Segovia in thinking that there were knights before kings, but

²⁹ In the introduction to his edition of *La Celestina* Peter Russell suggests that there is reason to believe that Cota could have been the author but that there is no conclusive evidence (Rojas 2007: 30-31); Dorothy Severin is of a similar opinion in her edition of the text (Rojas 1988: 15).

that the title of knight presupposes the existence of a king to confer such a title. In the fifth stanza Cota makes plain that the quality of nobility is inherent, a ‘don tan esençial’ (l. 37), and not something that can be acquired from any monarch, however exalted he or she may be. In addition, the final two lines of this verse also touch on the subject of royal blood just as Pero Guillén’s response does, with Cota stating that holding the royal sceptre does not dispel any of the baser traits of character in a monarch: ‘ni la yngrata vileza / alinpia el çetro real’ (ll. 39-40), lines that surely reflect the poet’s feelings of contempt for Enrique IV.

Despite the lyrical introduction of Cota’s poem, with its allusion to the ‘son del dulce tañer’ in the first line, the overall tone soon becomes sombre. Gómez Manrique’s *pregunta* is compared with a ‘boz en cuesta ríscosa’ in the final line of the first stanza, suggesting that the question posed is controversial and that Gómez Manrique’s opinion on the subject goes against much current thinking and is even potentially dangerous. In his third stanza Cota explains why he is choosing to make this type of reply which in the previous verse he has already admitted as discordant: ‘De aqueste yerro siniestro / de que aquí no me guardé, / algunt juýzio muy diestro / me pueden notar’ (ll. 17-20). The antithesis he uses in the rhyme of ‘siniestro’ with ‘diestro’ emphasizes that the point he wishes to make may be unpopular but he is confident that his own judgement is shrewd.

The second half of this third stanza deserves close attention since Cota declares that he is contributing to this debate uninvited ‘entre dos tales afrentas, / fablando commo burlado’ (l. 22), which indicates that he has some reason to feel aggrieved, perhaps suffering some insult or discrimination on account of his Jewish ancestry. There is no further explanation as to what has occurred, but some of the events that took place in Cota’s lifetime might well throw some light upon these lines. If we assume that Cota was born between 1430 and 1440 (Cantera Burgos 1970: 21), he would have been very much aware of the events of 1449, the year of the Toledo riots and the declaration of the *Sentencia-Estatuto* which banned all New Christians from holding office in the city. In September that year Pope Nicholas V issued a bull, *Humanis generis inimicus*, that condemned the exclusion of Christians from official posts on the grounds of their racial origins. Another bull of the same date excommunicated Sarmiento, the ring-leader of the Old Christians who had fomented the hostility towards New Christians which led to the implementation of the *Sentencia-Estatuto*. Since Castile was in a state of civil war, the Crown was desirous of keeping and obtaining as many influential allies as possible. Juan II therefore thought it expedient to ask the Pope to suspend the excommunication of those who were practising racial discrimination and in 1451 Juan gave his approval

to the *Sentencia-Estatuto*. A further victory for the Old Christians occurred in 1468, a year after more riots in Toledo, when Enrique IV confirmed the positions in the city of all the Old Christians holding offices previously occupied by *conversos* (Kamen 1985: 26-27). By this time Cota would have been an adult, no doubt with vivid memories of two incidents that must have been traumatic for his family and which may well explain his allusion to the ‘dos tales afrentas’. In the same year Carrillo condemned guilds in the city that had been created along racial lines, a move that doubtless would have been welcomed by members of his circle.

In spite of this underlying conflict, Cota’s poem ends conventionally enough. His excuse of ‘palabras no muy atentas’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 258, l. 24) can be taken as an indication of the self-effacing modesty which he feels obliged to express like his contemporaries and is reiterated in the final stanza where he returns to the comparison between music and poetry and refers to his poetic voice as ‘mi çençerro quebrado’ (l. 43). These protestations of modesty concerning the quality of his verse and the sentiments he expresses also serve to underline that he is speaking out independently. The second quatrain of this verse is apologetic, alluding to his ‘seso ynprudente’ and his ‘lengua ynsapiente’. This reminder of his own imprudence is made more emphatic by the use of antithesis to make a contrast between his ‘vana demençia’ and the ‘gran prudencia’ of Gómez Manrique which at the same time is flattering to the latter.

Juan Álvarez Gato on the Subject of Nobility

Even though there is no evidence that he participated in this discussion about nobility, one of Gómez Manrique’s poetic correspondents previously mentioned in this chapter, Juan Álvarez Gato, would almost certainly have concurred with what Noya, Cota and Guillén de Segovia say in their responses. Indeed, his writing in both prose and verse reveals a much more radical and developed attitude to the issue of nobility and inclusiveness than is demonstrated by these three respondents, who do little more than scratch the surface of this topic. As a *converso* he believed that all Christians were equal regardless of rank or lineage, and he makes this clear when he prefaces one of his religious poems with the words, ‘Al pie dun cruçifiçio questa en Medina sobre vna pared hecha de huesos de defuntos, puso esta copla para que veamos claramente como somos todos duna masa, y que esos deuen ser auidos por mejores, que touieron mas virtudes, pus que linaje, dispusiçión y fama y rriquezas todo pereçe’ (Álvarez Gato 1928: 136). In another poem, of more than a hundred lines, he defends a certain ‘moço

despuelas' in the service of Alonso de Velasco, who had written some *coplas* in praise of Hernán Mexía and Álvarez Gato. The fact that some people took a negative view of Mexía's praise of the groom's literary efforts inspired Álvarez Gato to speak out, not just in defence of Mondragón, the groom, but of those of humble birth whose virtues and merits should be recognized. The opening lines of this poem read, 'Cualquier noble costunbre / en la vida que tenemos, / la pobreza y seruidunbre / no le dexa arder su lunbre' (102). There follows a condemnation of those who engage in hypocritical flattery of the rich and, in the rubric to another stanza, of the tendency to 'pregonar virtud del grande o del rrico, avnque no la tenga' (105). In the penultimate verse he speaks of both Antón de Montoro and Mondragón as he warns against the worship of gold and worldly wealth and discrimination on the grounds of birth. Of Montoro he says, 'sy bien obra el de Montoro, / avnque pobre de tesoro / ténganle por rrico mucho' (106, ll. 11-13) and of Mondragón, 'sy discreto es Mondragón, / no curemos dell espuela' (ll. 17-18). In other words, Montoro's wealth lay in his talent and Mondragón's humble station in life should not detract from our appreciation of his gifts. Álvarez Gato also wrote a *prohemio* to accompany the poem for Hernán Mexía, explaining that the purpose of writing these verses was to emphasize that we should be aware of virtue when we see it and be unbiased in our acknowledgement of it, so that we should not 'atribuyr virtud o discriçión al fauoreçido o al rrico, sy no la alcança, y negalla al corrido y cuytado del pobre sy la tiene' (166-167). He cites Seneca as a model in his contention that he did not judge people on account of their outward appearance, and also reminds Mexía of the circumstances of Christ's birth: 'nuestro Redentor y Salvador [...] quiso naçer en vna pobreçilla cueva y morar en esta vida él y su bendita Madre, syn tener donde meter la cabeça, más miserablemente que ninguno' (167). He concludes with an allusion to Mondragón, saying that it is shameful that this 'fortunado y pobre varón' (168) should be denied the praise he deserves.

Gómez Manrique and Juan de Valladolid on Writing Poetry and Social Inclusiveness

While Mondragón was fortunate to find a defender of his verse in the person of Álvarez Gato, Juan de Valladolid, yet another of Gómez Manrique's poetic interlocutors, suffered much negative criticism and abuse. His connection with the Carrillo circle is somewhat tenuous and there is only one poem by him addressed to Gómez Manrique, but eight compositions to him by Gómez Manrique survive. They are of interest because they reveal some of Gómez Manrique's thoughts on the subject of writing poetry together with his attitude towards other writers who do not originate from

his social milieu. Juan Poeta, as he was also known by some, was probably born in the early 1400s in Valladolid, the son of a town crier (Montoro 1990: 130). His mother was a maidservant at an inn, according to Antón de Montoro, Suero de Ribera and Gómez Manrique himself. At any rate, as Lorenzo Rubio González says, ‘nuestro poeta fue hijo de un matrimonio de ínfima condición social y de indudable mala reputación’ (Rubio González 1983: 102). Although a *converso*, we do not know whether he converted to Christianity or if his parents had already done so. He led a nomadic sort of life; Marithelma Costa lists five distinct phases, the first of which finds him in Palermo, which was in the kingdom of Aragon, where he worked in the customs and as a bookbinder from approximately 1422-1444. Some years were spent in an itinerant lifestyle in Castile, Navarre and Italy, but by 1453 he was in Castile at the court of Juan II when he wrote a poem on the downfall of Álvaro de Luna. It seems likely that in 1455 he went to Córdoba with Juan Pacheco, marqués de Villena. Thereafter he was found in Italy, in the cities of Ferrara, Mantua and Milan before he returned to Valencia to attend the *indulgencia general* offered by Pope Paul II (Costa 2000: 34-35). His presence at this event on Maundy Thursday in 1470 provoked a furious anti-Semitic tirade in verse from another member of the Manrique family, the conde de Paredes. Archival research has revealed that Juan de Valladolid’s presence was valued in Italy, where Alfonso el Magnánimo was pleased to employ him in Palermo in 1434 and offered him a rise in salary when Juan returned to Sicily in 1444 (Conde Solares 2007: 40-41). In addition he appeared in Ferrara in 1458 with a letter of recommendation from Borso d’Este to Luis Gonzaga which refers to him as a ‘cortegiano del Re de Navarra’ (45). In Spain his fortunes were more varied, but he was, nevertheless, a beneficiary of the downfall of Carlos de Viana in 1460 when he was accorded the sum of 1300 *libras*, dues which formerly had been paid to the prince (45).

Apart from the poem addressed to Gómez Manrique only seven others by Juan de Valladolid have come down to us. Perhaps one of the best is on the death of Álvaro de Luna (ID0187, Dutton 1990-1991: III, 434), composed in 1453, by which time Juan had returned to Castile and appears to have been at the court of Juan II. The poem consists of four stanzas each of eight lines and a *cabo* of four lines, each stanza treating a different aspect of this momentous event. In the first verse, which is addressed to Luna, Juan reflects on the extraordinary suddenness of the *condestable*’s downfall after such a spectacular rise to power. In the second stanza he adopts a firmly moral stand and expresses the satisfaction of all people that justice has been meted out to a dishonest tyrant who had overreached himself to the extent that he exercised more power than the

king: ‘tirano, quería robar, / y mandar más que no el rey’ (ll. 21-22). The third stanza speaks of the temptations which Luna was unable to resist and which drove him to behave as he did, and of the vainglory, avarice and envy which brought about the ruin of so many citizens. Juan then speaks of the fact that the king was guided by God to imprison Luna and subsequently to condemn him to death. The *cabo* expresses gladness that Juan II is now effectively the monarch since he has freed himself of the influence of Luna, and he urges everyone to pay homage to him: ‘Agora eres tú el rey / magnífico & soberano / agora cumple la ley; / bésente todos la mano’ (ll. 34-37).

Juan de Valladolid demonstrated that he was also capable of writing in the courtly mode when he addressed two poems to the infanta María, expressing his admiration for her in the opening lines: ‘No veros mes osadia / de mis cuytas dezir / y veros gran couardia / y mas amar y sofrir’ (ID2302, Dutton 1991: I, 350). The second poem addressed to the same infanta is similar in tone and in its closing lines professes great respect: ‘que vuestra virtud y fama / me dan donde estoy dolores / causados no por amores’ (ID2303: I, 350). Another poem of only eight lines is a reaction to a rebuff that the poet has received from an unnamed lady, entitled *Otra de Johan poeta por repuesta* (sic?) *non buena de su dama* (ID2381: III, 43). He expresses his disappointment at her letter of rejection in a fashion reminiscent of courtly love poetry by declaring, ‘Que uos fizieron mis oyos / Por que tanto mal sentissen / Que lorassen mil enogos / Cada vez que la leyissen’ (ll. 5-8).

Finally, the poem bearing the rubric *Coplas de juan de valladolid o juan poeta porque vn cauallero le dio vn sayo de seda chico* (ID6768: V, 526) shows us a different aspect of Juan’s poetic ability where he develops a witty play on the word ‘sayo’ in response to a poem from a nobleman who sent a Jewish servant to present him with the gift of a tunic or ‘sayo’, saying that he and the servant would understand each other because they spoke the same language. Juan’s poem is actually addressed to the ‘sayo’ itself and, aware of the racial overtones of the message he has received, Juan declares, ‘Vos no soys sayo ni saya / tajo francés ni morisco’ (ll.1-2). The word ‘sayo’ is also found in the expression ‘cortarle un sayo a alguien’ meaning to gossip about someone in their absence and is used in this sense in the second half of the poem: ‘no sé cómo soys cortada’ (l. 6), suggesting that Juan seems to want to disregard this insult and snub its sender when he says in the final lines, ‘soys embiada por mote / pese atal que no soys nada’ (ll.7-8).

This hostility is also very apparent in the verses addressed to him by Gómez Manrique in whose poems it is possible to trace the development of his train of thought

from one poem to another and the charges that he makes against him. The very title of the poem entitled ‘De Gómez Manrique a mosén Juan, truhán del señor Conde de Treviño, su ermano’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 329-331) contains invective in its use of the insulting epithet ‘truhán’ and is sarcastic in tone since the title *mosén* was used to address members of the nobility. This poem contains a mixture of racist abuse concerning Juan’s Jewish ancestry, accusations of plagiarism and negative comments on the quality of his work, together with allegations of a mercenary attitude. The first two lines contain the insult: ‘Eres para loco frío / y para cuerdo, vellaco’, in other words Juan is either mad, in which case his verses are of poor quality³⁰, or if he is sane, he is a scoundrel. The adjective ‘loco’ recurs twice in this poem and in this first instance I would suggest that since he copies from others, an accusation made in the second stanza, Gómez Manrique is implying that Juan does not have the intelligence to appropriate better material as his own. At the start of stanza III Juan is described as ‘loco de quebrada’ which suggests that Juan is an itinerant entertainer who travels over rough and mountainous terrain and through ravines or ‘quebradas’. There is also, however, the implication that Juan takes a roundabout route on his travels in order to obtain more money: ‘porque te fagan el gasto / rodeas vna jornada’ (ll. 19-20). In the fourth stanza there is another accusation of avarice: ‘Eres tornado correo’, since the word ‘correo’ was used to mean a ‘money-bag’. The adjective ‘loco’ is used for the third time when Gómez Manrique declares that Juan is a ‘muradal de los locos’ (l.26), which is a further insult, since the ‘muradal’ was the wall outside the town where refuse was left. The implication here is that Juan is a social outcast living on the margin of society, where only the dregs of humanity exist, and certainly unworthy of the title *mosén*.

In four out of the poem’s five stanzas there are slurs about, or allusions to, Juan’s Jewish origins, some of them concerning his physical appearance, such as: ‘tienes el cuerpo de taco / la presençia de judío’ (ll. 3-4) and ‘Traes ... la crespilla de muça, / la nariz de maestre Yuça’ (ll. 9-11). In each stanza there is also criticism of either plagiarism or the quality of his poetry. In Gómez Manrique’s opinion poetry must contain elegant and witty turns of phrase, or ‘donayres’, a word that occurs twice in this poem (ll. 15 & 27). This is something that Juan rarely achieves, and when he does so his ‘donayres’ are lacking in originality; in a piece of extreme exaggeration, Gómez Manrique claims that Juan is only capable of producing witticisms at the time of the

³⁰ I have taken the word ‘frío’ to mean ‘of poor quality’ when used of verses since this is what it appears to mean in l. 31 of poem CXXV on page 335 of the edition used.

jubileo, a Jewish festival celebrated every fifty years. His wittiest verses are at the expense of his patron, but worse still, he steals ideas from other poets: ‘Eres traydor espía / enxerido en albardán; / nunca dizes conquerría / syno motes que te dan’ (ll. 21-24), the implication being that he insinuates himself into gatherings as a jester while noting the verses of other performers present. The fact that these allegations of plagiarism are repeatedly juxtaposed with reminders about Juan’s ethnic origins leads us to surmise that plagiarism and poor quality verses are inextricably linked in Gómez Manrique’s mind with Jewish origins. The lines ‘No curas de capirote, / a la guisa de Judea’ (ll. 13-14) are particularly telling when they immediately precede the comment ‘tus donayres son de bote, / no ninguno de bolea’. According to Jeanne Battesti-Pelegrin, the word ‘capirote’ has various meanings, one of which she gives as ‘capuche qui coiffe le docteur, le poète couronné’ and another as ‘métaphore du circoncis’ (Battesti-Pelegrin 1990: 245). Here Gómez Manrique is cleverly using the two meanings of this word to express how the low quality of Juan’s poetry is linked to his ethnicity, while at the same time demonstrating that he is able to produce witticisms in his verses, and at Juan’s expense. In addition, the notion of Juan being a ‘traydor espía’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 330) where poetry is concerned is developed in the next stanza when he is accused of being a ‘tornado correo’ (l. 25)³¹. In the final lines of this poem Gómez Manrique casts aspersions on Juan’s sincerity as a Christian, saying that he is happy for him to return to the Jewish faith, but he should work to earn what he is paid: ‘pues primero sudas bien / aquello que se te da’ (ll. 35-36). He is therefore a traitor on two counts, as a poet who appropriates the verses of others and passes them off as his own, and as an apostate who has abandoned his religious allegiance for financial gain.

Quite how seriously should we take these racial slurs? Writing about the literary conflicts that took place among poets earlier in the fifteenth century, David Nirenberg argues that Juan Alfonso de Baena in compiling the *Cancionero de Baena* in the late 1420s, ‘clearly agreed with Aristotle on the importance of insult and invective as a function of poetry. The *Cancionero*’s poets, nearly all Christian, are constantly defaming one another, and the accusation of Jewishness is prominent among the charges they hurl’ (Nirenberg 2006: 402-403). Although Gómez Manrique certainly wrote the poem discussed above several decades later, these remarks could certainly be applied to it, since it and subsequent poems contain a string of racial insults and invective.

³¹ ‘Tornadiço’ the diminutive form of ‘tornado’ is defined in Covarrubias’s dictionary as ‘El que se ha tornado Christiano, ora sea del judaismo ora del paganismo y gentilidad ... otros llaman tornadiços a los que aviendo recibido el agua del bautismo, se bolvieron a su primer vómito’.

Nirenberg continues by saying that the *Cancionero de Baena* has been seen as a 'staging ground for the competition between three classes of poet' (405). These three distinct categories of poet were those who wrote in the expectation of being paid, such as Juan de Valladolid, the *letrado* class whose number and influence were growing, and the aristocrats who belonged to families like the Manriques. As mentioned previously, both Baena and the marqués de Santillana speak of the many qualities and attributes that are necessary for the composition of good poetry, believing that these were confined to those who had received a good education and consorted with the upper échelons of society.

The assumption that the production of good poetry is the preserve of the nobility is reflected in another of the pieces that Gómez Manrique addressed to Juan, four stanzas entitled 'Otras a el mesmo sobre convenençia que al que mejor demandase le diese el otro' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 332-334). The poem is a sustained and cleverly developed insult based on the fact that he has become known as 'Juan Poeta'³². The use of this moniker is highly ironic since in his *Prohemio e carta* Santillana uses the term *poeta* as a term of praise when he says, 'passaremos a Miçer Françisco Imperial, al qual yo no llamaría dezidor o trobador, mas poeta, como sea çierto si alguno en estas partes del Occaso meresçió premio de aquel triumphal e laurea guirlanda, loando a todos los otros, este fue' (93-94). As Julian Weiss explains, there was a hierarchy amongst those who composed verses, the humblest of whom were the *remededores* who, as their name suggests, tended to borrow from other poets and rework their material, and the *juglares* who were usually itinerant minstrels, jugglers and acrobats. The *trobadores* were superior in that they were meant to be skilled composers of original verse and music (Weiss 1990: 30). The term *poeta*, however, implied greater erudition and as Weiss says, 'With the examples of Dante and Jean de Meun before them, vernacular writers throughout Europe began to emulate the concept of the philosophical poet, embodied by the term *poeta*' (14).

Gómez Manrique is doubly sarcastic in addressing Juan as 'Poeta de la nobleza / e de pura hidalguía' in the first lines of the poem mentioned in the previous paragraph (Gómez Manrique 2003: 332-334), since he obviously feels that Juan is not worthy of the status of *poeta* knowing full well that he is a man of humble birth. Juan's lowly origins are stressed when Gómez Manrique insults him by saying that he himself has so much 'hidalguía' that he could give half of it to Juan in exchange for money. He

³² Poem CXXIII in the edition used also refers to 'Juan Poeta' but I have not commented on it as I am unsure as to the meaning of the 'juego de palabras' to which the editor refers in his footnote on p. 332.

continues by suggesting that those like Juan will not go far in the world: ‘pues al hidalgo syn raça [.....] / no le dan pan en la plaça’ (ll. 6&10), declaring his patrician attitude towards the concept of ‘hidalguía’. The hyperbole used in the second stanza is striking since he compares the desire he feels to ask a question of Juan with the hunger that drives an eagle to accept food from someone’s hand. The analogy between the king of birds swooping low to satisfy its hunger and the nobleman, Gómez Manrique, demeaning himself to beg for information from a low-born rival heightens our expectations of the question to be asked. In the third stanza he makes two more exaggerated comparisons, in one of which he sees himself driven by the same necessity as the workmen who are forced to earn their living by breaking stones. The second analogy is with the ‘hambrientos ventores’ (l. 24), presumably Jewish tradesmen, who are forced to take a pig to satisfy their hunger, apparently in spite of the Jewish taboo on the consumption of pork. Gómez Manrique declares at the end of this verse that he is humbling himself by knocking at the door of the enemy, an indication of his resentment at the thought of upstarts such as Juan de Valladolid insinuating themselves into social and literary circles where they do not belong. There is added irony in the way he uses the title ‘mosén’, normally reserved for aristocrats, when addressing Juan in stanza II, as there is also in stanza III when he calls him ‘poeta muy elegante’ (l. 27).

In the fourth and final stanza he returns to the comparison that he made between himself and an eagle when he refers to their different ‘plumajes’ (l. 34) to explain why he wants to question Juan. He extends the analogy he has already made in the second stanza by using a hunting metaphor, as he does when writing to Pero Guillén on the subject of poetry (224), saying ‘vengo de neblís’ (l. 37), a ‘neblí’ being a type of falcon and the ‘capirote’ he wears can therefore be understood as the leather cap worn by the falcon when out hawking. As already stated, however, the ‘capirote’ also denotes poetic or academic achievement, which Gómez Manrique considers that he possesses, unlike Juan. A third meaning of this word is implied when Juan is told ‘yo sufro capirote ... / el qual vos, Juan, no sofrís’, since Gómez Manrique is reminding Juan of his Jewish heritage and the fact that he has been circumcised. It is not until the last two lines of the poem that we finally read the question to be put to Juan. The word *poeta*, used in the first line, recurs in the question: ‘dezidme lo que sentís, / poeta, con este mote’ (ll. 39-40), ‘mote’ meaning hear a ‘nickname’. Thus Gómez Manrique takes four stanzas, full of insults, to lead up to a question which turns out to be yet another insult.

A further poem of Gómez Manrique’s about Juan de Valladolid, ‘Sy de vuestra detención’ (334-336), alludes to his capture by Moorish pirates, possibly on his way to

the Holy Land as a pilgrim. Vidal González suggests that this may have happened in 1470 and Lorenzo Rubio González suggests that the purpose of this journey was to prove his Christian credentials (Rubio González 1983: 105). Although Rubio González does not say as much, it might be assumed that this was in response to the hail of abuse that Juan received from the conde de Paredes on the subject of his presence at the *indulgencia general* in Valencia that year. The tone of the poem, entitled ‘Otras trobas de Gómez Manrique a Juan Poeta quando le catiuaron los moros de allende’, is mocking as Juan is again addressed as *poeta* in the rubric (Gómez Manrique 2003: 334). In the first stanza Gómez Manrique offers scant sympathy at Juan’s plight, leaving him in little doubt as to his reaction on hearing of Juan’s capture: ‘vos lo podréys conoçer / judgando por la razón / y no por el parentesco / caronal’ (ll. 3-6). The topic of the difference between Gómez Manrique and Juan, that of the Old and New Christian, ‘çeçial’ and ‘fresco’ (ll. 7-8) respectively, is raised immediately. This theme is carried over to the second stanza and its wording is revealing of Gómez Manrique’s attitude. It encapsulates the differences at issue between the two men and demonstrates how, in Gómez Manrique’s view, they are diametrically opposed to each other by the way he portrays himself and Juan. Juan is a ‘confeso’ meaning convert and also a ‘noviçio’ (ll. 9-10). The use of the word ‘noviçio’ here is significant: its religious connotations reflect his supposed conversion to Christianity, and its meaning of a ‘beginner’ reinforces Gómez Manrique’s judgement of him as an unskilled poet. In contrast Gómez Manrique identifies himself as ‘antiguo profeso, / hidalgo desde abeniçio’ (ll. 11-12), meaning Old Christian.

There is, however, a patronising attempt to offer friendship to Juan by awarding him the accolade of *trobador* and this is emphasized by the use of the *pie quebrado* in the second half of this stanza: ‘pero téngovos amor / y amistad, / porque soys en la verdad / trobador’ (ll. 13-16). Gómez Manrique doubtless considered himself a *poeta* but, having used the term ironically in addressing Juan, cannot use it of himself. These three issues of race, nobility and status in the world of the poet are all raised in this stanza and are inextricably linked in Gómez Manrique’s mind so that he is either unwilling or unable to separate them one from another. This faint praise accorded to Juan is short-lived, as in the third stanza Gómez Manrique proceeds to insult him, reminding him, as before, that he is ‘syn capirote’ (l. 17). This insult is followed by pejorative comments on his poetic style which is lacking in originality and inspiration: ‘no trobáys boleas, / saluo las trobas de bote’ (ll. 19-20), a remark similar to those found

in the poem addressed to ‘mosén Juan, truhán del señor Conde de Treviño’ (329-331) already discussed above.

In this poem, however, Gómez Manrique goes further and puts forward the view that good poetry depends not only on originality and good breeding but also on the poet’s ability to learn the craft of writing. Here he again uses the imagery of the tools used by artisans to practise their trades in order to produce artefacts of beauty, just as he does when addressing Pero Guillén, but he declares that Juan’s verses are created using a hatchet or ‘destral’ rather than being elegantly fashioned with a ‘lima’ or file (ll. 21&23-24). The aristocratic poet with a high opinion of his own work, however, sees this as a reason not to consider Juan as a rival as he considers his work to be trite: ‘Y porque son de almacén / vuestras trobas’ (ll. 25-26) and condescendingly remarks, ‘mas antes vos quiero bien. / Ca no fazen ningún daño / a las mías [trobas], / porque son gruesas y frías / y d’estaño’ (ll. 28-32). The suggestion that Juan’s verses, like objects made of cheap tin, are ‘gruesas y frías’ is because to craft any fine artefact from metal requires heat. Furthermore, the criticism that they are ‘gruesas y frías’ implies that they have no finesse, because to craft anything successfully from metal requires heat. There is another barb in the final verse of the poem when Gómez Manrique expresses regret that Juan was captured by Moors and not by Jews because, as a renegade, he would have been amused to reacquire himself with the practices of his youth: ‘que donayre, / conoçierades el ayre / de pequeño’ (ll. 46-48).

Juan de Valladolid responds to these criticisms in the one poem that we have that he addressed to Gómez Manrique, the rubric of which reads ‘Que enbió Iohan Poeta a Gómez Manrique desde Aragón’ (336-338). It is noticeable how in this poem Juan makes no effort to defend the quality of his verses but reacts strongly to the anti-Semitic comments. This poem is reminiscent of Antón de Montoro’s verses which bear the title ‘Montoro sobre concierto de monte a don Pedro de Aguilar’ since it too explores the implications of participating in an excursion to hunt wild boar, an activity that would have been forbidden to the two Jewish poets’ ancestors (Montoro 1990: 124). Montoro, never one to try to hide his ethnic origin, shows an awareness of how strongly the religious observances of his ancestors have been inculcated in him and contribute to the mixed feelings he has about accepting such an invitation, saying, ‘yo me veo entre dos fuegos’ (l. 4). He explains that if he shunned this event he would be considered a coward, a criticism often levelled against the Jews, and that he would be considered a beggar, presumably because the ‘mendigos’ of this world were not accustomed to go hunting. On the other hand, if he were to kill a pig, the reaction of his companions

would be ‘que maté a mi enemigo’ (l. 8), which suggests they would consider his conversion complete and reveals how much importance they attached to such actions, indicative of acceptance of Old Christian behaviour, being publicly performed. This explains, perhaps, why in contrast, Juan de Valladolid is so eager to participate in such a hunt. His motives are twofold since he wants to cast off his Jewish heritage and at the same time find a way into the higher *échelons* of society. In the opening verse he challenges Gómez Manrique’s conviction that as the son of a poor man of lowly origins he cannot engage in the aristocratic pursuit of hunting. In effect he is challenging the exclusivity of the aristocratic poet by saying that it is possible to be upwardly mobile and that nurture has a vital part to play in the making of a nobleman: ‘con la notable criança, / el vil se haze hidalgo’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 336). His vivid description of the hunt, with the vigorous way in which he pursued his quarry, is calculated to impress those sceptical of his true conversion. Even more shocking to practising Jews is his account of how, having wounded the mother pig, he takes two piglets and shuts them in the synagogue. When challenged about his behaviour, he reminds his critics of the golden image of a calf that the children of Israel took to worshipping when they thought that Moses had deserted them in the wilderness and suggests that the two piglets be sacrificed in the way that Abraham took the ram to sacrifice instead of his son Isaac. Furthermore, in the final stanza he suggests that God might well say, ‘que no los mates del todo’ (l. 55). The second half of the last stanza suggests that Juan is being encouraged to join forces with the Christians and participate in the hunt.³³

In ‘Respuesta de Gómez Manrique a Juan Poeta’ (339-341, the poet remains unconvinced by Juan’s arguments, as he sees his participation in the pig-hunt as an example of the world turned upside down: ‘Preçian la tosca lauor, / lo dorado se desdora, / allý soes vos trobador, / de venados matador / vedados en el Atora’ (ll. 6-10). In the second stanza he pours scorn on Juan’s enthusiasm for the chase and, suggesting that his experience of hunting is limited, he implies that he was not even capable of recognising his quarry. He mocks him for thinking he was hunting a ‘garduña’ (marten) and then needing encouragement to continue the chase when he realized what he was in fact hunting: ‘después que por la vña / conoçistes la pesuña, / quisyérades vn alcorça’ (ll. 13-15). The tone of the poem becomes darker when he regrets the fact that Juan has disobeyed the law of the Old Testament, making a comparison between Juan and the traitor Judas Iscariot, although such comments are often regarded as standard anti-

³³ In spite of consulting dictionaries of old Spanish I am not sure how to interpret the last two lines of this poem and fail to see the relevance in this context of the editor’s footnote.

Semitic jibes. There follows another criticism of Juan's poetry, which he says is hastily composed and lacks polish. As in previous poems addressed to Juan de Valladolid, Gómez Manrique juxtaposes a statement about Juan's ethnicity with a criticism of his style of writing, adding that his work is hardly in the style of Virgil: 'Poeta no mantüano, / sabio syn forma ni modo, / no judío ni christiano, / mas exçelente marrano' (ll. 51-54). The final lines of the last stanza remind us of the initial verse in their allusion to the chaotic state of the world turned upside down. In the last stanza Juan is accused of creating chaos, not just by renouncing the faith of his forebears, but is made to feel responsible for the betrayal of Christ: 'porque vendistes a Dios, / segunt Lucas lo deuisa' (ll. 59-60).

Another attack on Juan de Valladolid is contained in 'De Gómez Manrique en nonbre del Ropero, contra Iohan Poeta' (341-345). El Ropero was the nickname of the *converso* poet Antón de Montoro who was a contemporary of both Juan de Valladolid and Gómez Manrique and is considered to have been linked to the Carrillo circle. Unlike most converts to Christianity, Montoro made no secret of his racial origins but, as I have already demonstrated when discussing his poem 'Montoro sobre concierto de monte a don Pedro de Aguilar', he often felt ill at ease among the Old Christian community despite his many protestations concerning the sincerity of his conversion. He and Juan de Valladolid exchanged verses over a period of twenty years, which may explain why Gómez Manrique chose to join in the literary tussle between the two writers in support of Montoro. The first line of the poem shows that this piece is intended for the marqués de Villena, otherwise known as Juan Pacheco, an ambitious and duplicitous man who wielded great influence over Enrique IV. Pacheco was also a nephew of Archbishop Carrillo and sought to be on good terms with his uncle and the Manrique family, sometimes conniving with them in opposition to the king when he felt it was in his own interests to do so. Montoro lived in or near Córdoba for most of his life and it has been suggested that this poem was written in 1455 when Pacheco visited Córdoba accompanied by Juan de Valladolid, possibly for the betrothal of Enrique IV to Juana of Portugal (Rubio González 1983: 104).

Most of the charges that Gómez Manrique makes against Juan de Valladolid have already been discussed, but in this poem he adds to the criticisms he has already made on the subject of his poetic style. Mindful of the need to conform to the rules of good practice in verse composition, he now maintains that Juan does not know about rhythm and scansion, something he has not mentioned hitherto: 'Él no sabe qué es açento, / no ditongo ni mancobre' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 342, ll. 11-12). The word

‘mancobre’ is defined in a footnote by Vidal González as ‘composición poética caracterizada por jugar con varias formas de un mismo verbo o de otras palabras’ (342n), which is the meaning given in Corominas’s dictionary. In the language of rhetoric this is probably what is called *annominatio*.³⁴ Clearly Gómez Manrique thought that Juan was not capable of writing verses that contained the witty and multiple layers of meaning that were appreciated at court by the higher échelons of society and considered that he owed his success in these quarters to his ability to recite, his ‘habla poderosa’ (l. 17) that made such a great impression on his audiences: ‘Qu’el tono de su eloquência, / [...] / engaña qualquier prudência’ (ll. 21&24). It is probably the difference between the talent as a performer which Juan must have possessed, making him a rival to Montoro, and the ability to write good verse, so highly prized by the educated classes, which spurs Gómez Manrique into making his criticisms of Juan de Valladolid since they belong to two separate traditions, those of the cultivated aristocrat and the peripatetic minstrel. Marithelma Costa expresses this idea when she writes, ‘Más que al oficio del poeta – o el individuo que se maneja dentro de la palabra escrita [...] – Juan de Valladolid se vinculaba a la memorizada, improvisada y leída’ (Costa 2000: 18). His praise for the way in which Juan is able to recite his verses gives Gómez Manrique the opportunity to engage in further denigrating observations about Montoro’s rival, reminding us of the humble occupation of his father, a town crier who, he says, knew more about ‘pregonar’ (l. 26) than his son does about ‘conponer’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 343). He then casts a slur on Juan’s mother by calling her a whore (l. 28). Gómez Manrique does not stoop to making this type of insult elsewhere in his verses, but since he is writing in Montoro’s name, he does this in order to imitate the type of insult that Montoro sometimes makes when abusing his rivals.

Since Montoro was himself of Jewish origin, Gómez Manrique cannot in this instance use racial slurs to insult Juan in the same way as he does when he writes as Gómez Manrique. The only reference to his physical appearance is when he remarks on Juan’s curly hair and calls him ‘este crespo trauado’ (l. 36). He would, however, have been aware that Montoro frequently proclaimed his Christian faith and this enables him to cast doubts on Juan’s *converso* status. Having alluded to him as ‘Juan Vellaco’ in the first stanza (l. 6), he implies that it is inadvisable to offer him hospitality in his house and issues a warning: ‘que cuyde ser otro Judas’ (l. 40), which is reminiscent of the condemnation made in his reply to Juan: ‘Pues soys de aquel origo / del que murió con

³⁴ Roger Dragonetti in *La Technique Poétique des Trouvères dans la Chanson Courtoise* defines *annominatio* as ‘faire jouer de différentes fonctions d’un même mot’ (Bruges, 1960, 40).

la sogá' (340, ll. 31-33). The reference to the link between nobility and literary ability is made more obliquely in stanza VI as Montoro, as a New Christian, could not insult a fellow *converso* in this way. Instead Gómez Manrique makes Montoro suggest that should Pacheco, having taken Juan under his wing, wish to grant any favour to Juan, he can give him a coat of arms with an emblem of an unattractive wild animal on it to wear in place of the sign that denoted his Jewishness. He adds that Juan should be baptized if he has not been so already as this will absolve him of his sin of stealing other men's prose and poetry.

Resentment at Juan's good fortune in obtaining such a patron as Juan Pacheco appears to be at the root of the conflict between Juan de Valladolid and Antón de Montoro at this juncture, as Gómez Manrique puts these words into the mouth of Montoro: 'a tal onbre medrar veo / con sus trobas d'almazén' (ll. 44-45). He chooses to capitalize on the poor relations between the two poets by reiterating his previous criticisms of Juan's poetic technique, using again the language associated with artisanal crafts to impart the notion that the writing of poetry is a skill that has to be learned. He comments that Juan's verses are 'forjadas de hierro viejo, / no con fuego, mas con frío' (ll. 46-47). In the second stanza he observes of his work that 'sus lauores son de cobre, / broñidas con mal asyento' (ll. 13-14), comparisons that are reminiscent of those in CXXV when Juan's verses are 'gruesas y frías / y d'estaño' (335, ll. 31-32). In the final stanza of CXXVIII the intense rivalry between Montoro and Juan de Valladolid is highlighted when, at the thought of Juan's acceptance into Pacheco's entourage, Gómez Manrique puts the following words into Montoro's mouth: 'sabed que con vn cabestro / m'entiendo colgar, señor, / e morir desesperado / por ver ese muradal / ante vuestra señoría' (ll. 73-77). In case the reader or listener should forget that the words of this poem have been put into the mouth of Antón de Montoro, Gómez Manrique makes him say in the final lines, 'e sy byuiere, cuytado, / adoraré mi dedal / dexando la poesýa' (ll. 78-80), reminding us that Montoro is a tailor by trade and a man of humble origins, something that Montoro was never ashamed to admit.

At this juncture it seems appropriate to mention that Juan de Valladolid and Montoro participated in a rancorous exchange of verses, provoked by a poem by Montoro which bears the heading 'Montoro a Juan de Valladolid, consejándole' in which Montoro makes criticisms of Juan's poetry similar to those made by Gómez Manrique (Montoro 1990: 100-102). Initially Montoro's tone is conciliatory, as in the first stanza he attempts to express solidarity with Juan by offering his advice 'como de padre o de hermano' (l. 5) and then by reminding him that their problems are similar:

‘por ser yo y vos judíos, / vuestros enojos son míos / y mis daños todos vuestros’ (ll. 8-10). In the second stanza he comes to the point he wants to make by trying to impress upon Juan that audiences at court demand high standards of the performers employed since they are composed of people ‘que más saben quel saber’ (l. 15) and who seek originality. Interestingly, Montoro like Gómez Manrique in CXXVIII (Gómez Manrique 2003: 341-345), uses the image of the forge when he says that the verses should be ‘recién sacadas de fragua’ (l. 17) and then comments that Juan’s efforts are uninspired: ‘que no tienen ni sal nin agua’ (l. 20). The third stanza suggests bluntly that he should find an alternative livelihood and the fourth warns that Juan will soon find himself out of his depth in court circles, even if at present he has been befriended by ‘algund galán’ (l. 31) who does not understand the need to earn one’s bread. The sting of this advice comes in the final stanza: that Juan should follow in his father’s footsteps and take up the much despised position of town-crier.

The ‘Respuesta de Juan de Valladolid’ (Montoro 1990: 103-104), to this poem contains no effort to defend his poetry but is instead a sustained attack on Montoro which shows that he has no regard for the advice offered to him: ‘non vos precio más que un figo’ (l. 4). In the first of the five stanzas Juan de Valladolid launches into a vitriolic attack on Montoro, calling him ‘confeso, marrano, / redondo como un bodigo’ and in the second claims that his rival is much reviled by others and attacked both verbally and physically. He sullies the reputation of Montoro’s mother in the third verse, implying that Montoro has inherited certain traits of character from her and in the fourth pours scorn on his work, suggesting that it is he, Montoro, who should seek another way of earning his living: ‘o rapaz de carnicero / por buen mojón verdadero, / Antón, vos alquilarán’ (ll. 38-40). In the fifth verse Montoro is accused of arrogance: ‘Vos presumís de gallo / con vuestro saber dinano’ (ll. 41-42) and told that he is a man of little brain: ‘debéis el seso enmendallo / que lo tenéis de avellano’ (ll. 44-45). Finally, Juan declares that as a town crier he will be better off than Montoro will be practising his trade as a *ropero*. Another poem by Montoro (130) is of two stanzas, each of four lines, which is prefaced by the rubric, ‘Montoro a la reina sobre que Juan de Valladolid, fijo del pregonero, dijo que había fecho unas coplas que Montoro ficiera y le enviara’. He tells the queen to ‘mandar guardar la vajilla’ (l. 3) because if Juan is capable of

stealing what cannot be seen, he will certainly steal what is visible: ‘ca quien furta lo invésibo³⁵ / furtará lo que paresce’ (ll. 7-8).

Like Montoro, Gómez Manrique in another short poem of just two stanzas, ‘De Gómez Manrique, consejo a Iohan Poeta’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 345), suggests that it is time that Juan found another occupation. He admits that Juan works hard but that his efforts are ‘vn fruto que se yela’ (l. 12), another reference to the lack of warmth that must be overcome to forge a good poem, even if he concedes that ‘avnque bien labréys d’açuela / no tenéys el enguixuela’ (ll. 13-14). Juan does not possess the ‘tools of the trade’, but in this poem there is no explicit suggestion that Juan’s social status has any bearing on his literary ability.

Gómez Manrique’s final poem to Juan de Valladolid bears the rubric ‘Coplas de Gómez Manrique a Iohan Poeta que le demandaua pan en su tierra e dezía que le auía librado el Arçobispo quatroçientas fanegas de trigo el arçiprestadgo de Halía’ (346-348). In the first two stanzas Gómez Manrique rejects an appeal from Juan to be paid in wheat for his services as a ‘trobador’ on the grounds that he already has more grain than he can store. Criticism of Juan’s work is now expressed using imagery connected with building rather than forging objects from metal: ‘Vuestras obras son labradas / de gruesa manpostería; / las mías, de cantería / con escodas afynadas’ (ll. 27-30). There follows an allegation concerning Juan’s parentage when an allusion is made to his father’s occupation, ‘trobador / era de fynos cohechos, / y de las rentas y pechos / y derechos / un alto pregonador’ (ll. 42-46), alleging that his father was corrupt. He then resorts to sarcasm, suggesting that with such a father, the mother of this ‘elegante poeta’, as he refers to him, must have a guilty secret. Although both sides of his family were involved in trade of a low variety, somewhere along the line some literary talent has entered the family and it is not from the town crier his father.

The seventh stanza and *fyn* of this poem poses a problem of interpretation when the poet turns to the question of how he should reward Juan: ‘no sé qué se pueda dar, / saluo solo vna capilla / para que vos pongáis lüego / no por agua, mas por fuego / que anda cabo Seuilla’ (ll. 66-70). In trying to date this poem Vidal González, in a footnote to his edition, comments on the allusion to ‘agua’ and ‘fuego’, informing us that the Inquisition initiated proceedings in Seville in 1481 and there is also an account of torrential rain and flooding in that city the same year. The editor suggests a definition of

³⁵ In a footnote to her edition of Montoro’s poetry Costa refers to Corominas and Pascual’s *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico* to explain that ‘invesibo’ is derived from ‘ver’. It should therefore be taken to mean ‘invisible’ in this context.

‘capilla’ in line 67 as ‘capa pequeña’, but this does not explain how a small cloak would save Juan from the ravages of flooding or the Holy Office, if indeed this poem was written in 1481 or 1482, which seems unlikely. In 1481 Gómez Manrique was grieving for his son and daughter, who had both died the previous year, and was probably beginning to draft the *consolatoria* that he composed for his wife, while at the same time being occupied with his post as *corregidor* of Toledo. The ‘capilla’ of line 67 of this poem could simply mean ‘chapel’, intimating that the poet thinks that a chapel, where Juan could pray and perhaps seek sanctuary, would be a more appropriate gift for him rather than yet more grain of which he already has a surfeit.

Gómez Manrique and Antón de Montoro were not the only poets to launch these kinds of attacks on Juan de Valladolid. Suero de Ribera mocked him in a poem he wrote when he was in Naples at the same time as Juan, *Coplas de Ribera a Juan Poeta, estando los dos en Nápoles* (ID 6773, Dutton 1990-1991: V, 527). He ridicules him cruelly on account of his father’s occupation and appearance, saying that even the dogs began to bark when the *pregonero* came in sight: ‘que no hay perro que nol’ ladre’ (l. 14). One of Gómez Manrique’s relatives, the conde de Paredes, was much more vicious and anti-Semitic and wrote two long poems to him, one accusing him of becoming a Muslim when he was captured at sea by pirates (ID 6756, V, 540-542) and a second on Juan’s attendance at an *indulgencia general* in Valencia (ID 0219, V, 542-544). The second of these poems is a long and sustained tirade of 124 lines against Juan’s presence in the cathedral of Valencia, which is seen as defiling it. In the conde’s opinion, the papal bull ‘se tornó con gran quebranto / escriptura del talmud’ (ll. 9-10) and he speaks in a similar vein throughout the poem, for example in lines 26-28 he says, ‘el calix de consagrar / se quiso hazer cuchillo / para vos circuncidar’.

Clearly, Gómez Manrique’s jibes at Juan de Valladolid are pale in comparison with those of the conde de Paredes and, although they contain abuse referring to Juan’s ethnicity, they are based partly on criticism of Juan’s literary efforts. There had, however, been a tradition of this type of criticism amongst other poets before him and Gómez Manrique is continuing it, but at the same time extending its range to posit the idea that converts do not write good poetry. As Jeanne Battesti-Pelegrin puts it, ‘l’affirmation formulaire dénigrante de la judaïté du convers est toujours associée à la déclaration et à la démonstration, et cela est nouveau, de son incapacité poétique’ (Battesti-Pelegrin 1990: 243). It may seem strange that Gómez Manrique, who belonged to the circle of Archbishop Carrillo, with its inclusive attitude towards New Christians, should engage in the racial insults discussed in this chapter, especially since he had

amicable exchanges in verse with other poets of Jewish origin and made a point of supporting Montoro against Juan de Valladolid, despite the fact that Montoro made no secret of his ancestry. Gómez Manrique appears to resent the way in which Juan de Valladolid overstepped what he saw as the boundaries between the aristocratic class and the itinerant poets. As the nephew and great admirer of the marqués de Santillana, he ignores the words of his great mentor who praised the work of Rabi Santo and quoted the following lines from his *Proverbios*: ‘Non vale el açor menos / por nasçer en vil nio, / Nin los exemplos buenos / por los dezir judio’ (Santillana 1984: 93).³⁶

Obviously the arrogant attitude adopted by Gómez Manrique towards Juan de Valladolid shows some ambivalence and does not sit easily beside those generally espoused by the Carrillo circle towards *conversos*. He obviously admired the *converso*, Alonso de Cartagena, to whom he sent some *estrenas* and refers to him as ‘otro San Pablo’ in his *planto* for the marqués de Santillana (Gómez Manrique 2003: 314-315, 388). Alonso’s niece, the nun Teresa de Cartagena, was encouraged by Gómez Manrique’s wife, Juana Mendoza, to write a defence of her *Arboleda de los enfermos*. Gómez Manrique could hardly have been unaware that this defence, the *Admiración Operum Dei*, was dedicated to his wife. As *corregidor* of Toledo, later in his career, Gómez Manrique showed great moral courage in his defence of *conversos* when in 1478 he discovered that some Old Christians were plotting to assassinate him. In his *Crónica de los Reyes Católicos* Pulgar reports a speech that Gómez Manrique is reputed to have made in which he expresses his total rejection of those who discriminate against others on the grounds of their ethnicity, declaring, ‘A todos (Dios) fizo nobles en su nacimiento; la vileza de su sangre e oscuridad del linage, con sus manos la toma aquel que dexando el camino de la clara virtud se inclina a los vicios del camino errado’ (Pulgar 1943: I, 350). Gómez Manrique also struggled, with limited success, to delay the establishment of the Inquisition in Toledo.

In spite of his obvious sympathy for *conversos* who were well educated and sincere in their faith, Gómez Manrique’s vilification of Juan de Valladolid can probably be explained as resentment towards a man he judged to be unschooled in the poetic arts and who had aspirations to be considered a *poeta* when he was little more than a *juglar*. Not only does he resort to anti-Semitic jibes, but he vilifies Juan in other ways: his literary shortcomings, as he sees them, and the poverty of his upbringing as the son of a

³⁶ Another instance of Gómez Manrique’s anti-Semitism arises in ‘Sabe Dios que me pesó’ (326-329) in which he attempts to be humorous on the subject of the losses sustained by a relative who engaged in a game of gambling with a Jew.

town-crier and a servant of dubious respectability, all in an attempt to defend himself and others of his caste from the infiltration into their milieu of one he deems an upstart.

Chapter V Matters of State (c.1463-1473)

Gómez Manrique spent many years engaged in the internecine strife that raged across the Peninsula, largely supporting the Castilian crown but also aligning himself with the Aragonese in his earlier years. On the death of Juan II in 1454, when he and many other nobles decided to support Enrique IV, he was appointed *corregidor* of Salamanca where he remained for three years.³⁷ He subsequently held the same office in Burgos in 1463. In 1465, having supported the dethronement of Enrique and the crowning of the infante Alfonso, he became *corregidor* of Ávila.³⁸ In this way, while he had firmly nailed his colours to the Castilian mast by this stage in his career, in view of his earlier mixed allegiances, he was obviously not unsympathetic to the Aragonese cause. His real rise to power and influence seems to have been after the premature death of Alfonso in 1468 when, together with Alfonso Carrillo, he enthusiastically supported the infanta Isabel's claim to the throne over that of Enrique's daughter Juana. By playing an active role in bringing about the marriage of Isabel and Fernando of Aragon he sowed the seeds of peace and unity between the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon.³⁹ After the accession of the Reyes Católicos to the throne of Castile in 1474 he was duly rewarded for his work in favour of the stability of the two kingdoms and was appointed *corregidor* of Toledo, remaining a close advisor to the Crown for the rest of his life. This aspect of Gómez Manrique's life and political career is reflected in a number of major poems.

De Gómez Manrique quando se trataua la paz entre los señores reyes de Castilla e de Aragón e se desabinieron

Gómez Manrique's desire for unity between the two kingdoms is reflected in 'Del Señor es fecho esto' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 619-621). The poem gives us no clues as to its date, but both Vidal González (619n) and Paz y Melia (Gómez Manrique 1886: 351) suggest that it refers to negotiations that took place between Enrique IV and Juan II of Aragon in 1463. This dispute had implications beyond the Iberian peninsula because Enrique had received overtures of friendship from ambassadors sent by Edward

³⁷ Enrique IV's second wife, Joana de Portugal, receives a poem of fourteen nine-line stanzas (303-308) from Gómez Manrique in which he lavishes praise upon her; it was probably written in 1455, the year of her marriage.

³⁸ Gómez Manrique demonstrates his loyalty to Juan II in 'Muy alto rey poderoso' (296-297) on the birth of the infante Alfonso in 1453. His support for Alfonso after the 'farsa de Ávila' is demonstrated in the *estrenas* he composed for the young prince's fourteenth birthday (315-316) and also the *momos* composed for him at the request of the then infanta Isabel (668-672) for the same occasion.

³⁹ The poet addresses Isabel in 'Aquel Dios que vos crió' (313), two *décimas* of *estrenas* for Christmas 1467, wishing her happiness in the coming year. His allusion to a 'moço, gentil y valiente' (l. 18) who would make her a queen is presumably to the then infante de Aragón, Fernando.

IV of England who was seeking an alliance with Castile against France. Since Louis XI of France appeared to be supporting Aragon at the time, it was in Castile's interest to forge an alliance with England, thereby putting pressure on Aragon to come to an accord (Palencia 1999: II, 243). According to Alonso de Palencia, Diego de Valera and the *Crónica anónima de Enrique IV*, archbishop Carrillo and Juan Pacheco were despatched to Bayonne to negotiate with the Aragonese. Gómez Manrique makes no mention of his presence in Bayonne, but all three chroniclers record that he was present at Saint Jean de Luz the following month when Louis arrived to celebrate an agreement that had been reached (Palencia 1999: 243-244; Valera: 1941: 85-86; *Crónica anónima*: 131).

The first of the eight *octavas* of this poem confirms the wording of the rubric which intimates that discussions about peace are ongoing, since Gómez Manrique expresses a fear of the negotiations failing. He sees hostilities between two Christian states as foolish because it weakens them both and lays them open to attack from their enemies. In the second and third stanzas he suggests that such disputes should be left to pagans, whereas unity between Castile and Aragón will strengthen them both. His warning of the consequences of not following this advice reveals a very restrained, mature and prudent approach to what is happening when he says, 'y sy no fazéys lo tal, / yo fiador / que quien librare mejor / libre mal' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 619-620, ll. 21-24). If 'librar' is taken here to mean to complete an action successfully, as suggested by Vidal González (620n), Gómez Manrique is advocating that the best way of concluding the discussions between Castile and Aragón is to avoid any sense of triumphalism on the part of either side in order to implement an agreement successfully. His use of the *pie quebrado* in these lines, where 'fiador' rhymes with 'mejor' serves to emphasize the firmness of his convictions. Similarly, in the following verse he comments that reaching an agreement, even if difficult, is never as harmful as discord: 'que no puede ser tan mala / la concordia / que non faga la discordia / mayor tala' (ll. 29-32). Again the *pie quebrado* stresses the importance of 'concordia' and the 'tala', or the prejudicial consequences, of failing to resolve their differences.

The argument in favour of making peace is strengthened by the thought that a pact to cease hostilities is worth more than the uncertainty of obtaining victory. David's triumph over Goliath is cited as an example to be borne in mind: he reflects that while some, like David, have been victorious in conflicts despite appearing to be the weaker party, something he attributes to the work of God, others have been successful despite being cruel and unjust. With this in mind, Gómez Manrique warns that the powerful

need to be fearful and the weak even more so. Perhaps he had a premonition of what was to happen, since the king of France did not hold to the agreement that had been reached, as Diego de Valera observes: ‘el rey de Francia [...] con tiránica voluntad menospreciando la conveniencia que estaua entre él y el rey de Aragón, no solamente quiso ocupar a Perpiñán, más la cibdad de Elna, y todos los lugares del condado de Ruysellón, lo qual el rey de Aragón no pudo sufrir’ (Valera 1941: 86).

The final stanza of this poem is an appeal to the two sides to join forces for another reason, that of their shared ancestry: ‘pues que fuystes deçendientes / de vnos antecesores’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 621, ll. 58-59). Since Enrique IV’s father, Juan II of Castile and Juan II of Aragon were first cousins, both being grandsons of Juan I of Castile, Gómez Manrique urges the two sides to set aside their differences and unite in solidarity against threats from their neighbours.

The conciliatory tone of the poem just discussed is far removed from another by Gómez Manrique in which he reveals his exasperation at the poor and corrupt state of government in an imaginary Castilian town, often thought to be Toledo.

The Esclamaçión e querella de la gouernaçión

This poem of eighteen *octavas*, ‘Quando Roma prosperaua’ (571-576), stands out from the rest of Gómez Manrique’s writing on account of the sense of impatience that it imparts which contrasts with the measured tones in which he nearly always expresses himself elsewhere. Various dates have been suggested for its composition but Nicholas Round argues convincingly for placing it towards the end of 1464 or early in 1465, asserting: ‘Its markedly aggrieved tone would link it, [...], with the sharply antagonistic turn taken by Spanish politics after the autumn of 1464’ (Round 2013: 150). This is a reference to the group of nobles who banded together not only to complain about what they saw as Enrique IV’s poor government, perceived Islamophilia and certain defects of character, but also to demand that his half-brother, Alfonso, should be named as heir to the throne in preference to his daughter Juana whose legitimacy was questioned. All these details are recorded by the chronicler, Palencia (Palencia 1999: 293-295), and Round also makes reference to other sources that claim that Enrique was making gestures of appeasement in the form of financial rewards to the members of the Manrique family in early 1465 (Round 2012: 151). Enrique, however, was unwilling to meet the demands made of him, which led to the crowning of Alfonso in Ávila by the rebel nobles, an occasion at which Gómez Manrique was present. These events lead Round to think that this poem was very

probably written in the spring of 1465 in a final attempt to persuade Enrique to govern in a way more acceptable to the nobles (150-152). Certainly the poem could not have been written any later than 1466 since it was glossed by Pero Díaz de Toledo who died during that year.

The overriding theme of these verses is the need for good government if a city is to prosper. The opening stanza refers to ancient Rome in the time of the republic and the consulate of Quintus Fabius Maximus: the city flourished under his rule and mention is made of the Roman matrons who made personal sacrifices to support the city in time of war. The second stanza is in stark contrast, with its description of an unnamed ‘pueblo’ where the poet lives and where ‘al neçio fazen alcalde’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 572, l. 10). Although it is known that Gómez Manrique was living in Toledo at the time, there is nothing to identify this ‘pueblo’ or any of its inhabitants by name, although Nancy Marino suggests that the foolish mayor might be Beltrán de la Cueva, one of Enrique IV’s favourites who was then at the height of his power and influence, having been appointed *maestre de Santiago* in 1464 (Marino 2003: 218). There follows a series of what are called ‘*Ensienplos e sentençias*’ in the rubric (Gómez Manrique 2003: 572), illustrating what the poet sees as the world turned upside down, where people of inferior ability are valued more highly than the more able, and material objects of poor quality are highly prized in preference to those of real value, for example, ‘¡mirad qué gouernación, / ser gouernados los buenos / por los que no lo son!’ (ll. 22-24) and ‘fierro preçiam más que oro, / la plata danla de balde’ (ll. 11-12). The use of the words ‘*cuerdos*’, ‘*locos*’, and ‘*locura*’ (ll. 29, 30, 48 & 54) all reinforce Gómez Manrique’s exasperation at the current state of affairs which is summed up in the lines, ‘*Los cuerdos fuyr deurían / de do locos mandan más*’ (ll. 29-30). Stanza IV also has echoes of Matthew’s gospel: ‘que quando los çiegos guían, / ¡guay de los que van detrás!’, reminiscent of Matthew 15, 14: ‘And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch’.

Gómez Manrique’s advice about how good leadership can be achieved is delivered in a series of warnings of the consequences of ineffectual government. Men in posts of responsibility need to be able to exert their authority over those under them. Without *regidores* (l. 33) and good kings (l. 79) prosperity is short-lived. Reference is also made to effective military men who must be in command for their troops to be successful: ‘*las huestes sin capitanes / nunca son bien gouernadas*’ (ll. 39-40). Likewise the people must be led into battle by their ‘*caudillos*’ (l. 101) if they are to fight well. Other people in different walks of life are also deemed necessary for the successful

functioning of society, as Gómez Manrique mentions the Church which needs its *letrados* (l. 65). Three stanzas later he states that sheep without a shepherd can do damage to property and, interestingly, he cites the example of the Church: ‘religiosos sin mayor / grandes cometen maldades’ (ll. 91-92).⁴⁰ The need for control on the part of those with responsibilities is seen as a way of laying firm foundations to society, as expressed in stanza VIII: ‘Quanto más alto es el muro, / más fondo çimiento quiere’. This is a warning that a leader who does not manage to reach the top of this metaphorical wall is bound to fall.

Gómez Manrique sees a lack of justice in the anonymous ‘pueblo’ in question, where wrong-doing goes unpunished and services rendered are unrewarded in stanza VII. In the following stanza he observes that the just suffer in an unjust society where greed and self-interest prevail: ‘Donde sobra la codicia / todos los bienes fallecen; / en el pueblo sin justiçia / los que son justos padeçen’ (ll. 61-64). Self-interest is also singled out for comment in VI where it is considered foolish: ‘quien se guía por su seso / no va llueñe de locura’ and in XI where it is seen to be dangerous: ‘do rigen por afixión / es peligrosa morada’ (ll. 87-88). In X the need for justice to be carried out according to the law is expressed with the added comment, ‘los reynos sin buenos reyes, / sin adversarios se caen’ (ll. 79-80). The repetition of the verb ‘caer’, also used in VIII, makes the warning clear: a kingdom can be destroyed, not by an enemy state, but by internal unrest caused by lawlessness, which surely reflects the growing tide of dissatisfaction felt by Enrique IV’s opponents. Finally, in XVII ‘cudiçias particulares’ are blamed for the fall of the Roman Empire.

Gómez Manrique also voices his belief in the advantages of seeking wise counsel from the elder statesmen of the realm like himself when he declares, ‘Los mancebos sin los viejos / son peligrosa metal’ (ll. 69-70). This statement might seem at odds with his criticism at the start of stanza III when he complains ‘Queman los nuevos oliuos, / guardan los espinos tuertos’ if one takes the ‘nuevos oliuos’ to refer to the younger generation of men aspiring to assume posts of responsibility. When, however, one considers stanza XIV, it becomes clear that what he wants to avoid is a lack of temperance and moderation when he says, ‘Es peligro nauegar / en galea sin los remos, / mas mayor es conuersar / con quien sigue los extremos’ (ll. 105-108). This could be

⁴⁰ The only other instance of criticism of the clergy by Gómez Manrique is in the *Razonamiento de vn rocín a un paje* (322-326) in which an elderly nag explains that he has been ill-used in the past, ridden by by a priest who ‘más liebres en mí contadas / el mató / que dixo desque naçió / misas rezadas’ (ll. 21-24).

seen as another veiled criticism of the behaviour of the monarch and his followers, but also as a warning against reacting to events too impulsively.

Various images are used to stress the importance of social cohesion in the city, for example, just as a town without *regidores* will have limited success, so an uninhabited house becomes dilapidated: ‘la casa sin moradores / muy prestamente se llueue’ (ll. 35-36). In XI Gómez Manrique expresses the need for the town to be populated or the surrounding land will be laid waste and in XV he insists on the necessity of the different estates of society co-operating with each other: ‘Los menudos sin mayores / son corredores sin salas; / los grandes sin los menores, / como falcones sin alas’. In other words, just as the ‘corredores’ give access to the large rooms of a house, so do the ‘menudos’ or lower orders of society play a supporting role by enabling their social superiors to carry out their obligations; the social hierarchy must be protected in order to maintain high standards of leadership.

As Round points out, the final couplet of the second stanza describes how those in charge of the unnamed and corrupt town ‘caçan con los aguilechos / cómense los gauilanes’ as evidence that the poet ‘asserts a familiar class-based grievance against Enrique IV’s low-born favourites’ (Round 2012: 158). The opening lines of stanza IV, ‘La fruta por el sabor / se conoce su natio’, echo the words of Matthew’s gospel: ‘Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit’ (Matthew 7, 16-17). Gómez Manrique is referring to this biblical quotation to make a comparison between the quality of fruit harvested from a poor tree and the inability of those in positions of responsibility in the ‘pueblo’ to govern well. This is another expression of distaste for the men in Enrique’s immediate circle whom he considers to be ill-suited for the posts they occupy. In stanza XVI Gómez Manrique returns to this image of the fruit tree: ‘Que bien como dan las flores / perfeçión a los frutales, / así los grandes señores / a los palacios reales’ (ll. 121-124): the nobles’ vital role is to support the monarch. This concept is elaborated in stanza XII: ‘las cortes sin caualleros / son como manos sin guantes’ (ll. 95-96), suggesting that the presence of knights at court can also have a refining or moderating influence. The second quatrain of this verse makes it plain, however, that the prince should be worthy of his place at the top of the social ladder: ‘e los príncipes derechos / luzen sobr’ellos sin falla, / bien como los ricos techos / sobre hermosa muralla’ (ll. 125-128). The message seems clear: Enrique is not a ‘príncipe derecho’ but consorts with unsuitable men rather than

surrounding himself with ‘los grandes señores’, the very people who are plotting rebellion.

In the penultimate verse the poet returns to the subject of the first, that of ancient Rome, to remind the reader that its prosperity lasted only as long as it was well governed, but when the self-interest of its citizens took over decline set in. The final verse voices the fear that a similar fate will overcome his own ‘pueblo’ if the current situation continues. These final two stanzas give the poem a small degree of structure in what Round describes as a ‘loose-knit, digressive, often repetitious recital of complaint’ (Round 2013: 155), yet he suggests that a certain structure is to be found in the *sentencias* which end each cluster of three stanzas since they highlight one particular aspect of the poet’s concern (155-156). This thesis does not always stand up to a close reading of the poem, since lines 47-48 ‘quien se guía por su seso / no ua llueñe de locura’ do not appear to sum up entirely the content of that stanza and the two that precede it. Similarly, lines 73 and 74 which start a new cluster of three stanzas, would appear to echo the final lines of the previous stanza

Scholberg comments on the apparent lack of structure of the poem: ‘este revoltijo de lugares comunes que ha confeccionado el poeta intencionadamente refleja el caos de la sociedad’ (Scholberg 1984:31), but this would have been a very innovative technique on the poet’s part. Nancy Marino refers to the poem as ‘una lista algo amorfa’ (Marino 2003: 214). Perhaps a better key to explaining the seemingly chaotic sequence of images is to be found in Pero Díaz de Toledo’s gloss on the poem where he says that Gómez Manrique’s writing ‘non discrepa de los santos e profetas que semejante querella quisieron fazer a Dios’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 578). This statement suggests that the rather disjointed form of the poem follows the example available to him from the Old Testament book of *Lamentations*, a litany of verses despairing at the state of the city due to the transgressions of its inhabitants which opens with the words: ‘How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people’. Four verses later the words ‘Her adversaries are the chief, her enemies prosper’ would doubtless have rung true to Gómez Manrique.

The choice of vocabulary to describe this situation of ‘the world turned upside down’ is also indicative of the poet’s reaction to what he sees, with certain key words recurring frequently to convey a sense of exasperation. Apart from the repetition of the words ‘loco’ or ‘locura’, already mentioned above, the danger of the situation is emphasized with the use of ‘peligro’ or ‘peligroso’ four times in stanzas X to XIV (ll. 76, 88, 105 and 112), while ‘caer’ and ‘caída’ occur three times (ll. 59, 80 & 140) to warn of the disastrous consequences of bad government in a city. The word ‘gouernar’

and its cognates recur frequently (ll. 22, 23, 27, 28, 40, 75 and 144). Similarly ‘regir’ occurs in lines 2, 87, 132 and 138, with its cognate ‘regidores’ in line 33. Comparisons between good government and the steering of a ship abound; no fewer than six words for ship can be found: ‘nauío’, ‘barco’, ‘nao’, ‘galea’ and ‘carracas sin barquetes’ (ll. 28, 76, 85, 106 and 115). Particularly noticeable is the constant use of anaphora, with the word ‘sin’ occurring no fewer than thirty-six times between stanzas V and XVI to denote the lack of control or preparedness for action that the poet observes in this ‘pueblo’. To quote Round again, this poem is a *querella* and writing in that genre ‘repetition and anaphora counted for more than logical ingenuity’ (Round 2013: 155).

Pero Díaz de Toledo’s Reactions to the *Esclamación e querella*

Four responses to this poem have come down to us: by Pero Díaz de Toledo, Pero Guillén de Segovia, Antón de Montoro and Antonio de Soria. The fullest and most detailed is Díaz de Toledo’s voluminous prose commentary poem (Gómez Manrique 2003: 577-618), many times longer than the poem and probably written in late 1465 or 1466, the year of his death. This *letrado* had translated classical texts at the court of Juan II and had been chaplain to the marqués de Santillana. After the latter’s death he moved to the household of Alfonso Carrillo, where he would have known Gómez Manrique

Originally the function of a gloss on a text was explanatory, giving information to aid comprehension in the margins of a manuscript; later glosses became longer, summarizing a text’s content. A further development came when the gloss became a full-blown, discursive commentary in which the author took the original text as a starting-point to explore its wider implications. Some texts were glossed by their authors, one example being the marqués de Santillana who annotated his own *Proverbios*. Santillana’s glosses were then expanded by Díaz de Toledo to the extent that ‘*Los proverbios* became a theological and philosophical tract’ (Weiss 1990: 129). He did the same for Gómez Manrique’s *Esclamación*, taking a sequence of *mundus inversus* images to produce ‘a new and scholarly treatise, this time centred on a unified political theme, and the elevation of a poet to the rank of contemporary *auctor* who continues the traditions of the saints and prophets of old’ (130).

The rubric *Yntrodución al dezir que conpuso el noble cauallero Gómez Manrique*, is perhaps significant, suggesting a need to explain the content and gives its author the opportunity to interpret it in the manner he chooses. Feeling the need to justify his action in writing this gloss, he asks Carrillo’s permission to do so. It is plain

from his comments that the poem had received a mixed reaction and some people were obviously disturbed by its content, ‘interpretando la sentençia e palabras de algunas de las coplas a no sana parte, en manera de reprehensión’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 578). Others, however, supported Gómez Manrique, ‘afirmando ser verdad lo en las coplas contenido e non aver cosa que calupniar en ellas’ and this is the reason he gives for taking it upon himself to explain Gómez Manrique’s views (578). These remarks tell us a lot about the public ambience in which Gómez Manrique wrote and the relative immediacy of the impact of his writings. Never overtly partisan, Díaz wants, he says, to show ‘quand enseñadamente escriuió e que su escriuir non discrepa de los santos e profetas que semejante querella quisieron fazer a Dios de la que este cauallero muestra fazer en aquestas coplas’ (578). He submitted this commentary on Gómez Manrique’s poem for Carrillo’s approval, asking that if the archbishop is satisfied, it should be circulated among his household. Díaz may have thought that he would be more adept at countering the objections to the poem’s content than the archbishop, but he takes care to add that he is sure that Gómez Manrique will also know how to explain his intentions in writing it.

Although Díaz never openly supports the sentiments aired in the poem, his comparison of Gómez Manrique with the Old Testament prophets suggests his approval of the work’s content. It is significant that before embarking on his commentary he digresses and makes some reflections on the origins of poetry, citing amongst others, Moses, Solomon, Homer and Virgil before mentioning Pérez de Guzmán and Santillana. The reason for this digression might be that as recently as the mid 1440s, some clerics had taken a negative view of poetry, one of these being the distinguished theologian, Alonso de Cartagena, who sought to control the reading habits of the aristocracy (Weiss 1990: 24). Díaz de Toledo, however, has no reservations in this respect and offers qualified approval for Gómez Manrique who, he thinks, has the potential to produce poetry of the same quality as Guzmán and Santillana ‘sy el tienpo le da logar a continuar e continúa, yrá en el alcança a los caballeros nonbrados e publicará su yngenio de buenas e fructuosas cosas’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 581-582).

Díaz de Toledo does not write a gloss on all eighteen stanzas of the poem but limits his extensive commentary to only nine of them. There is a certain amount of overlap in the content of the various glosses and I shall therefore try to deal with his comments on a thematic basis. His reactions to the complaints of Gómez Manrique are a mixture of those of a theologian offering his wisdom to a lay person and comment of a political nature which is influenced by writers both from classical antiquity and from the

Christian tradition. The measured tone of his learned commentary acts as a foil to the impatient tone of Gómez Manrique's verses which become in his hands a springboard to examine in much greater detail the issues that they raise.

The Example of Ancient Rome

He begins by commenting on the first stanza, pondering on what it was that made Rome such a great power. Since at the period to which Gómez Manrique is alluding Rome was neither a Christian state nor a monarchy and could not therefore be considered a parallel with Castile or an obvious role model, Díaz de Toledo has recourse to Saint Augustine. He quotes from his work, *The City of God*, in which the saint explains that although the ancient Romans indulged in pagan practices, early on in their history they prospered because they were not greedy for material gain but instead sought praise on account of their virtue, putting the good of their country before all other considerations. This state of affairs did not last, however, and Saint Augustine quotes Sallust who in turn quotes Cato. Cato, who embraced the tenets of Stoicism, praised previous generations of Romans for their industry and integrity, and laments the corruption that has emerged in the Rome of his contemporaries: 'los premios e gualardones que se han de dar por virtud véndense por dinero' (584).

Díaz de Toledo not only refers to this corruption in ancient Rome, but raises another issue, that of monarchy, reminding us how king Tarquinius was banished because the ancient Romans resented his power over them: 'no pudiendo los romanos sufrir el yugo real, dexaron de tener reyes e fizieron dos enperadores o capitanes a los quales llamaron cónsules' (583). Although Díaz de Toledo says nothing about the fact that these men held an office that was not hereditary, it is significant that he uses the verb 'fizieron' here to show that the consuls were elected by the people. The function of these men was to advise rather than to rule and he does not conceal the way in which monarchical rule was seen by the Romans: 'Aquel estado real no es auido commo la bienquerencia del que conseja, mas commo la soberbia del que enseñorea' (583). It is hard not to draw the conclusion that Díaz de Toledo was thinking not only about the corruption of contemporary society but also of the way in which Enrique IV was conducting his reign. It shows a critical attitude on his part in an age when the monarch was supposed to enjoy absolute power.

This theme emerges again in the gloss on stanza V where Díaz de Toledo supports Gómez Manrique's view that a town needs to be governed, quoting both the book of Proverbs and Lucan before referring to the *Siete Partidas* which consider the

monarch as ‘vicario de Dios en lo temporal e tiene su lugar en la tierra; e el pueblo o los pueblos son su cuerpo e miembros’ (600). He asks the question, which was raised in ancient times, whether it is more important to have a good king or good laws, and recalls that Aristotle held that a king was subject to human passions and could therefore err, so that it was more important to have good laws in place. Díaz de Toledo continues by saying that the king is subject to both natural and divine law and, although he can sometimes modify laws he cannot remove them completely, he concludes: ‘e avnque sean libres e sueltos (los reyes) de subjecçión quanto a las leyes posytivas, honesta cosa farán de ser subjectos de se regir e gouernar por ellas’ (600-601). Again it is likely that Díaz de Toledo is thinking here of the situation in Castile where Enrique IV had absolute power with the legacy that he had inherited from his father Juan II and Álvaro de Luna. Angus MacKay describes how, even before their victory at Olmedo in 1445, Juan II and his favourite had summoned the *cortes* in order to impose the concept of absolute royal power (MacKay 1977:138-139). Regarding Enrique’s subsequent behaviour, MacKay remarks, ‘Time and again noble factions found their plans thwarted by the king’s inordinate fondness of using his absolute power’ (141).

Divine Providence

In the second stanza of his poem Gómez Manrique reveals his scorn for the appointment of unsuitable people to positions of responsibility and the lack of appreciation shown for things of value. Díaz de Toledo takes up the first two lines, ‘En vn pueblo donde moro / al nesçio fazen alcalde’ and uses it as a starting point for pondering not only the problem of the foolish who govern but also that of the just and virtuous who go without reward or recognition for their good qualities. He quotes Jeremiah: ‘Señor, ¿por qué la carrera de los malos prospera?’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 588) and then takes the opportunity to launch into reflections on divine providence, a subject which he considers to be ‘de las más altas (materias) que ay en la Sacra Escritura’ (589). He disagrees with Aristotle who thought that God’s providence did not descend to such lowly matters on this earth and refers to Boethius to support his opinion. It is however, to the Old Testament Book of Job that he alludes several times when further considering the question.

Why should Díaz de Toledo place so much emphasis on the life of Job? Díaz de Toledo was a *converso* and in an article on Guillén de Segovia and the circle of Alfonso Carrillo, Carlos Moreno Hernández, citing Márquez Villanueva, remarks on the distinction that can be made between those New Christians who accepted ‘la religión

más formalista y oficial de los cristianos viejos' and those who supported 'un cristianismo más auténtico, con influencias de San Pablo y de Séneca' (Moreno Hernández 1985: 31). The book of Job, with its story of the suffering and resignation of its protagonist, offers an example of Stoicism as embraced by certain Christians at this time who were influenced by the writings of Seneca. Díaz de Toledo, who translated some of Seneca's works, reminds us that Job's three friends erred when they insisted that the pain men suffer in this world is divine punishment. Job is held up as an example of a good Catholic because, after a period of despair and bitterness in the face of many disasters, he came to believe in retribution and reward in the afterlife. The fact that he did so supports those who, like Moreno Hernández, say that the writers belonging to Carrillo's circle, many of whom were *conversos*, embraced an inclusive form of Christianity that took to heart the message of Saint Paul when he said to the Galatians: 'You were baptized into union with Christ, and now you are clothed, so to speak, with the life of Christ himself. So there is no difference between Jews and Gentiles' (31).

It is perhaps noteworthy that this *converso* writer should choose a Jew as his example and actually use him as a role model when he lived in a society that had seen so much violence committed against Jews and *conversos* and in which the insistence on *limpieza de sangre* had caused so much havoc. Neither Gómez Manrique in his poem, nor Díaz de Toledo in his gloss, mention this or the atrocities committed in Toledo during the pogrom of 1449. That particular episode of violence was caused by demands from Juan II for additional taxes to be raised, the chief tax collector being a family member of the *converso* poet Rodrigo Cota. As a result of the ensuing turmoil men of Jewish origins were barred from public office by the Sentencia-Estatuto of 1449 and many others were killed or injured. Both Díaz de Toledo and Gómez Manrique would have been aware of these events and it is not unreasonable to assume that the first two lines of the second stanza of the *Esclamación* reflect the fact that Toledo had lost many able inhabitants of Jewish origins who had played a significant role in the administration of the city.

Reference is made again to Saint Augustine who is quoted as asserting that God in his wisdom so arranged matters that all men, whether virtuous or not, should be exposed to good and evil. Pain and suffering come to men whether they are virtuous or not and no man, however much he may have sinned, should feel rejected by God when he sees that the virtuous and godly also suffer the same pain as he does. The good and virtuous in the community are prudent in their enjoyment of the benefits they derive from the temporal world: 'el bueno e virtuosso non se ensorberueçe con los bienes

temporales, non se abate nin quebranta con los males' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 594). The fact that the undeserving gain office is all part of God's plan for the world, and Díaz de Toledo concludes this section of his commentary with the reflection that people get the government they deserve: 'Dios por su profundo e alto saber dispone e ordena de tales gouernadores de quales los gouernados son dignos' (596). In other words, Díaz de Toledo is in agreement with Gómez Manrique and shares his condemnatory view of contemporary society. He does, however, develop his thoughts further on this subject in his gloss on stanza IV when he quotes from Matthew 10, 23 to say that it is wise to flee persecution and find another city to live in, recalling that Joseph and Mary took flight into Egypt with the infant Jesus.

Justice

He makes use of two of Gómez Manrique's stanzas, VII and X, to discuss the topic of justice. In his gloss on stanza VII he cites Aristotle when affirming that justice is the greatest of all virtues but he also quotes from Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, Saint Augustine and Cicero. Perhaps the most trenchant quotation he uses is from Saint Augustine: 'Sy la justiçia es apartada e quitada de los reynos, no son otra cosa los reynos synon grandes conpañías de ladrones, e las conpañías de ladrones no son otra cosa synon pequeños reynos' (605). He offers consolation to those who suffer injustice by asserting, as he has already done, that God will reward the virtuous and punish the guilty in the life to come. He develops the theme of justice further when he considers stanza X and again refers to Aristotle's question as to whether it was more important to have a good king or good laws, as he did in his gloss on stanza V, confirming his view that it was better to have good laws. He goes on to say that it is also important that the law should be put into practice by people who are competent to do so. He advocates a pragmatic approach to the interpretation of the law, so that justice may be seen to be done and that individuals do not interpret the law to gain personal benefit at the expense of others. He responds to Gómez Manrique's warning that without a good system of justice the state will fail, by saying that what matters is that the law should be put into effect in the spirit in which it was conceived: 'la buena gouernación de los reynos e vniuersydades es en aver executores buenos de las leyes que las apliquen a la yntençión del que las ordenó, e tomen entre las opiniones de los doctores aquella opinión que vieren más benigna e amiga de la ley' (614).

The Clergy

Díaz de Toledo also chooses to comment on stanza IX and here he elaborates on the need for prelates of the church to have sufficient knowledge to be able to defend the Catholic faith and resist heresy. Just as the walls are what holds up a palace, so knowledge supports the church and he quotes Saint Jerome: ‘los labrios del sacerdote guardan justiça e la ley se buscará e requerýa de su boca, que ángel de Dios es’ (608), a clear statement of conviction about the priest’s importance role in society. It is not just knowledge that is needed, however, but experience, and Díaz de Toledo then refers to the second half of the stanza on the subject of the young. Quoting Aristotle, he acknowledges many good qualities of the younger generation, but he points out that Alexander the Great depended on the counsel of old men who had seen many campaigns and emphasizes the importance of taking advice from the wise and experienced. He recalls the words of Sallust who said that all advisors should be devoid of ‘toda yra e de toda malquerençia e de toda amistançia e de toda misericordia’ (612) so that by being unbiased they may make good judgements.

The Three Estates and Social Cohesion

In his comments on stanzas VI and XII Díaz de Toledo turns his thoughts to the structure of society. Regarding XII he quotes Aristotle again: a kingdom is divided into ‘defensores e oradores e labradores’ (616). The first group are the nobles who should be like ‘los braços del rey para le ayudar e tener el reyno en paz e la execuçión de la justiça’ (616) without whose support the king would find it hard to rule. The second group are the clergy who pray for God’s grace and the third are the workers who are needed so that they ‘procuren los fructos de la tierra de que todos se mantengan’ (616). On glossing VI he speaks of the need for all citizens to have a defined role in order that there should be harmony. Mindful perhaps of the various conflicts that were taking place in Castile during the 1460s, he emphasizes the importance of obedience to the governor of a city or the leader of an army, as otherwise chaos will reign: ‘Ca pueblo syn capitanes es commo cuerpo syn cabeça, dispuesto a total perdiçión’ (603). If all men carried out the duties assigned to them the kingdom would prosper and there would be harmony, and here he reminds us of Gómez Manrique’s words when he makes the comparison between a well-ordered society and a *vihuela* that has been properly strung. He interprets the final two lines of this verse, ‘quien se guía por su seso / no va lueñe de locura’, as meaning that it is unwise to insist unduly on one’s own opinions since a man’s judgement can be corrupted by personal considerations: ‘sy ombre ha de fazer

alguna cosa que toque a persona que mucho ama o a persona que quiera mal, no juzgará derechamente de lo que ha de fazer' (605).

In the final paragraphs of his gloss on stanza XII Díaz de Toledo digresses and discusses the origin of the word *corte*, one of the derivations supposedly being from the verb *cortar* because, he says, 'en la corte ha de estar el espada de la justiçia que ha de cortar a todos los males e todos los tuertos e las fuerças e las soberuias que se fazen' (617), thus returning to the subject of justice. The *cortes* should be frequented by those members of the first estate, as otherwise the king would find himself unable to maintain peace or justice and, looking back to Gómez Manrique's words, says that the *cortes* would be 'desnuda commo las manos syn guantes' (617). He then alludes to a dialogue in one of Seneca's tragedies in which the emperor Nero is told by the author that it is right that he should be surrounded by wise men who, with the welfare of the state in mind, will counsel him. He should be disposed to grant pardons and refrain from imposing cruel punishments in order to create peace because 'aquesta es la mayor virtud que puede aver en el príncipe, e que los príncipes que procuran la paz e tranquilidad en su tienpo tiene camino dispuesto e aparejado para el cielo' (617). By alluding to the behaviour of Nero, Díaz de Toledo is distancing himself from overt criticism of contemporary events, but the implication is that there are parallels to be found between the Nero and the current monarch. He concludes his comments by reminding us that Christ taught us that a kingdom in which there is peace and good government will prosper and flourish, but that one that is divided will fail and be destroyed.

Guillén de Segovia's Response

Pero Guillén de Segovia, like Díaz de Toledo, a member of Alfonso Carrillo's household, produced seventeen stanzas entitled *Coplas en respuesta de Quando Rroma prosperaua*, which follow the same rhyme scheme (Guillén de Segovia 1989: 129-133). In comparison with the original poem this is a restrained piece of writing, but it is evident that the author is not altogether in agreement with Gómez Manrique while at the same time being very guarded in the way in which he expresses himself.

In the first two stanzas he reflects on the subject of praise, flattery and adverse criticism. When he states that 'Quyen retrata de personas / do tanta virtud sençierra / y les roba sus coronas, / çiertamente mucho yerra' (ll. 5-8) he appears to be referring to the nobles' rebellious attitude towards Enrique IV. On the other hand, he is also against praise which is not justified: 'Del consejo desadoro / donde todos dizen dalde / fermosura no es tesoro / mayormente da(l)bayalde' (ll. 9-12). Assuming that

‘da(l)bayalde’ in modern Spanish would be ‘de albayalde’, the meaning of which is ‘white lead’, a substance used in cosmetics in the Middle Ages, in this context it would imply the use of false flattery. Guillén de Segovia then resorts to making an analogy with the bird kingdom when he says that he does not want to see ‘falcones galanes / que faze(n) buelos de mochos / y presas dalcavanes’ (ll. 14-16). The falcon is traditionally considered a noble bird, loyal to its master, which suggests that he does not wish to see the nobler members of society reduced to a more lowly rank, the equivalent in the world of birds to ‘mochos’ (owls) or ‘alcavanes’ (curlews). He seems to be sitting on the fence, since he is uncomfortable at the thought of criticizing the monarch and yet he appears to side with the old nobility who are offended by the treatment they have received.

Mindful of the effect of expressing his opinions, he warns that it is unwise to speak out and make enemies within one’s own circle: ‘quien de suyos fase agenos / no gobierna dyscrpción’ (ll. 23-24). Excesses are to be avoided and he recalls the Stoic virtue of temperance in the fourth stanza, when he advises striving for prudent restraint: ‘Syenpre vi naçer error / del pensamiento vazio / y creçer en mas onor / do prudencia doma el brio’ (ll. 25-28). There appear to be words of warning in the fifth stanza where Pero Guillén thinks it is a mistake to dare to speak plainly, claiming that he has seen honest people act in such a way as to cause those beneath them to suffer in long drawn-out conflicts. In the sixth stanza he declares that those who weave subtle plots and sail against the prevailing wind are motivated by self-will rather than reason: ‘amaynar deve sus velas / quyen a viento del revés / de voluntad bive preso’ (ll. 43-45). They must trim their sails to avoid being hurt where there is no justice. He appears to suggest to Gómez Manrique that he should be more prudent in the pronouncements that he makes in what has become an unjust society.

Guillén de Segovia offers some thoughts on the nature of nobility in his seventh stanza, making it clear that his concept of nobility depended on the personal honour and integrity of the individual when he says, ‘Nobleza segund su grado / en virtud nos amonesta; / quyen corrompe tal estado / su alta sangre requesta’ (ll. 49-52), thus implying that failure to live a life of virtue compromised a person’s nobility. He exhorts us to live in the present and not to become corrupted or to think of the future since we have no idea of what it has in store for us, but insists that nobility should not become corrupt even in times of disaster.

Pero Guillén reinforces the Stoic idea that virtue is its own reward when he comments on those who speak out bravely in favour of those who have been wrongly

condemned and by so doing achieve a pardon for them: ‘De los que fablan osados / perdones son sus mercedes / de ynoçentes condenados’ (ll. 66-67). He uses an image based on the game of chess to warn of the inherent dangers of being outspoken when he asserts, ‘que quyen pierde sus trebejos / recabe xaque mortal’ (ll. 71-72), the ‘trebejos’ being the chessmen and the ‘xaque mortal’ checkmate.

In the next three stanzas (ll. 73-96) the poet focuses his attention on the state of the nation. Although he claims to be restrained in what he is saying, he notes a change in the social atmosphere when he observes, ‘vi fuscar dia sereno / con ayre caliginoso [...] toros bravos fechos bueyes / desde al yugo se retraen’ (ll. 76-77 & 79-80), implying that power has fallen into the wrong hands, and thus agreeing with one of the central ideas expressed in Gómez Manrique’s original poem. He expresses his surprise and disappointment at this state of affairs by declaring, ‘pues de tan alta nación / no sespera tal errada’ (ll. 85-86) and goes on to opine that nobility has become debased and tarnished: ‘su vygor proçede vano / de la ley ques usurpada’ (ll. 99-100).

The final four stanzas contain a statement of Guillén de Segovia’s conviction that although there are times when silence should be maintained, there is a moral duty to speak out when it is appropriate to do so. The man who is guided by reason retains his judgement and in speaking out shows evidence of society’s turmoils: ‘De rebueltas y rigores / tales fablas son señales’ (ll. 113-114). The moral value of standing up for your principles and not being deflected from your purpose is upheld when the poet declares: ‘quien en virtuosos hechos / mucho constante se halla / arterios nin pertrechos / no corrompe su batalla’ (ll. 117-120) and he continues in this vein by declaring that it is fitting to pay the ultimate price for one’s beliefs: ‘digo ques bien porfiar / en morir sobre la fe’ (ll. 123-124). Those who deny the faith are not sincere in their outward practice of religion.⁴¹

Antón de Montoro, on the other hand, responds to five of Gómez Manrique’s *octavas*, the first of which is a gloss on the opening stanza, ‘Quando Roma prosperaua’. To emphasize the idea of the loyalty that existed in the past but which is fast disappearing Montoro first uses a nautical metaphor to convey the image of a ship moving backwards: ‘En esos tiempos bogaba / lealtad, la cual hoy cía’ (Montoro 1990: 276, ll. 1-2). He follows this by evoking the picture of a boy keeping watch while his master sleeps, strongly suggesting that the responsibilities of government are in the hands of the inexperienced due to the idleness of their superiors. In the first couplet of

⁴¹ For line 128 I follow the transcription of Dutton (1990-1991, IV: 202-204) who suggests ‘el roce de los altares’; Moreno Hernández (1989: 132) gives ‘() (ro) () de los altares’.

his second quatrain he reflects on the fact that nowadays anyone who acts with integrity only lays himself open to harm. There is a change of subject in the final two lines when Montoro draws an analogy between giving fodder to lazy animals and encouraging men who are idle, which can again be interpreted as a criticism of those holding the reins of power.

The second gloss is on Gómez Manrique's second stanza where Montoro focuses on the verb 'moro' in the original poem and uses it with a completely different meaning when he highlights the willingness of men to falsify their true nature for personal gain: 'Ya vimos a negro moro / bien ponerse el albayalde, / y a buen cristiano de coro / parallo color de jalde' (277, ll. 1-4). The second quatrain opens with the lines 'y muy bravos aguatochos / ahogar y dar afanes' (ll. 5-6), suggesting perhaps that people are not of sufficient courage to stand up to the upheavals they face in political life. A similar technique is used to introduce the third gloss where Montoro links the word 'arroyo' of Gómez Manrique's seventh stanza to 'malvado'. In her edition of Montoro's poetry Marithelma Costa points out that in one manuscript the first line of this gloss reads 'Las entradas del mal vado', thus maintaining the image of moving water, but completely changing the subject of the comment that he makes. He continues by warning that one has to be prepared to act against the arrival of men intent on attack. Montoro's fourth gloss is on the third stanza 'Queman los nuevos olivos' where the parallel between ineffectual government and the 'dead wood' of the trees is retained from the original poem. The second quatrain introduces harsh criticism of the inhabitants of this imaginary town who are afraid to express their opinions frankly: 'Los naturales que ajenos / se hacen con opinión' (ll. 5-6).

The shortest gloss, a single *octava* by Antonio de Soria, reveals nothing of his thoughts on the issues raised in the poem, saying that he now finds it hard to write verse because of his increasing age. Those who ask him to do so are misguided: 'mas do tú, Vejez, te entonas / todo bien se nos destierra; / assí que a tales personas / quien les pide coplas yerra' (ID 2043, ll. 5-8), which might well suggest that he did not wish to become involved in any controversy.

In conclusion, the *Esclamación* was clearly intended to cause a stir and did so. While Antonio de Soria refrained from comment, Antón de Montoro's use of a diverse set of images in a similar style to the original poem, suggests that he is supportive of Gómez Manrique. Guillén de Segovia sits on the fence; his approach is that of a man who wishes to avoid further conflict and confines himself to making a few general statements about nobility and the integrity of standing up for one's principles. It is a

solemn and temperate piece of writing and, while engaging with Gómez Manrique's complaints, seeks to mollify those who have taken exception to it. The fact that Díaz de Toledo chose to write such a lengthy and erudite gloss confers considerable status on the poem and on Gómez Manrique whom he praises in his introduction (579). By offering explanations to some of the stanzas and thereby clarifying their meaning, he clearly wishes to support Gómez Manrique and give a degree of solemnity to his message, drawing on such well-established authorities as Aristotle, Saint Augustine and Boethius.

While, as we have seen, Gómez Manrique was composing verses to engage with what to him was the bitter political reality under Enrique IV during the mid 1460s, a few years later he felt able to write two other works in a very different tone. Both were written after the marriage of Isabel with Fernando of Aragon in 1469. One is addressed to Fernando; the other is to both Fernando and his wife and is a major work concerning matters of state for them to ponder before their accession to the throne.

De Gómez Manrique al señor Príncipe de Castilla e de Aragón, Rey de Seçilia

This poem of five *décimas* (621-623), addressed to Fernando of Aragon, can be dated to 1473 by which time Fernando had married the infanta Isabel of Castile, thus creating a rapprochement between the two kingdoms. Fernando's father, Juan II of Aragon, had managed to hold on to the city of Perpignan and the area known as Rousillon, much to the regret of Louis XI of France who was now threatening to attack Perpignan and hoping that Charles of Burgundy would help him. Both Diego de Valera (Valera 1941: 246-261) and the *Crónica anónima de Enrique IV* (*Crónica anónima*, 1991: II, 412-423) relate the events that took place and stress the bravery not only of Fernando but that of his elderly father who refused to leave Perpignan despite the entreaties of the Aragonese and Catalans who were with him. The French besieged the city and, although they greatly outnumbered the assembled Aragonese, Catalan and Castilian forces, were defeated.

It is not clear where Gómez Manrique was at the time of writing these verses, for if he took part in the fighting there is no mention of his presence in the chronicles. He does, however, write in the first person plural as if he went as one of the Castilian contingent to go to the rescue of Juan II and the Aragonese and Catalan forces, and there is a strong suggestion that he was also present when Fernando took his leave of Isabel. The intention of the poem, however, is not to discuss these events but to lavish praise upon both Fernando and Isabel.

Fernando is compared to the Trojan warrior Hector because his qualities of leadership are such that the Castilians feel themselves lost without him: ‘Estamos commo galea / careçiente de patrón’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 622, ll. 11-12). Gómez Manrique extols the virtues of Isabel, emphasizes her sadness at Fernando’s departure, and holds her up as a model of marital fidelity, comparing her to the turtle-dove, the stock symbol of fidelity in medieval bestiaries: ‘La qual fuye las verduras / commo la tórtola faze’ (622, ll. 21-22).⁴² He also compares her to the goddess Diana, the personification of chastity. In the final stanza Fernando is hailed as the king-to-be of Aragon and Gómez Manrique declares his support for Fernando as the future king of Castile and Leon. He is praised for his action in Rousillon and urged to secure the future of that region with the words, ‘pues tomastes tal empresa / no la dexedes represa, / que no es para dexar, / ni la hermosa syn par / muy eçelente Prinçesa’ (ll. 46-50). This is a statement of confidence in the leadership of Fernando and in making it Gómez Manrique is vindicating his active participation in promoting the marriage of Isabel and Fernando.

Much as he may have admired this young couple, he took it upon himself to write a long poem, known as the *Regimiento de príncipes*, preceded by a *prohemio* in prose, in which he offers advice on how best to govern the country when they accede to the throne. Both were written at some point after their marriage in October 1469 and before the death of Enrique IV in 1474, as the dedication to the ‘Prinçipes de los reynos de Castilla e de Aragón’ attests. Despite the fact that he is writing to his social superiors, he is not afraid of telling them how they may work towards self-improvement.

Gómez Manrique’s *Prohemio* to the *Regimiento de príncipes*

The *prohemio* explains the reasons for writing the poem. If we are to take literally what he says, Gómez Manrique was motivated by a combination of forces. He finds it natural that men and women should feel a patriotic love of their country and, as a member of a family of ancient and noble lineage, he considers himself particularly well fitted for this task. Conscious of the fact that he has not succeeded to any title as a younger son of a nobleman, he points out that he has, nevertheless, inherited certain attributes which can neither be passed on nor taken away in a will, namely ‘el amor natural que mis pasados touieron a esta patria donde honrradamente byuieron e

⁴² There are echoes of the *Romance de Fonte frida*, when the turtle-dove declares, ‘que ni poso en rama verde - ni en ramo en flor’ (Díaz Roig 1976: 233) and also of Ausiàs March in his *maldit* à propos Na Monboí (March 1997, ed. Archer: 180).

acabaron y están sepultados' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 625). There is an admission on the writer's part that he does not have the power that some of his family have wielded (625), but he is desirous of exercising some influence in offering his advice. He has already served and supported Fernando in the past and speaks of certain negotiations in which 'la alteza vuestra de mí se ha querido servir' (626). This is presumably an allusion to his part in bringing Fernando and Isabel together and working with Carrillo and Juan II of Aragón to promote their marriage, as Gómez Manrique was involved in the complicated negotiations which took place to secure the betrothal of Isabel and Fernando and it was he who took the news to Juan II of Aragón, Fernando's father, that its terms had been agreed between Archbishop Carrillo and the Aragonese envoy Peralta.

Why should Gómez Manrique have written the *Prohemio*? Perhaps initially it was intended only to be read by Isabel and Fernando whilst the poem itself was for more public circulation. There is certainly a contradiction to be found between the two texts which might support this view. In the *Prohemio* the poet expresses the hope that the couple will be such good monarchs that the memories of both their good and bad predecessors will be forgotten, or if that is not possible, at least that they will not be spoken of. This is rather surprising since not only does the poem contain a number of stanzas on the subject of past monarchs, most of them bad, but the section on the virtue of prudence makes a point of saying that where temporal matters are concerned it is important for those in government to be mindful of the past: 'lo passado memorar' (266).

The wording of the *prohemio* is more forthright than that of the poem itself particularly in what is said about the need for strong monarchs. In the *prohemio* there is overt criticism of the situation in which Spain finds itself due to the damage inflicted by a succession of weak kings and mention is made of their 'grande oprobio y difamia suya e destruyción d'estos reynos' and the 'crudas llagas' that have been inflicted upon the nation (p. 626). Another contradiction between *prohemio* and poem is to be found when, speaking of the inevitability of disaster that ensues with a bad government, Gómez Manrique comments: 'no ha menester vuestra alteza abtoridades ni enxemplos antiguos pues los modernos bastan asaz, sy con claros ojos mirarlos querrá la real señoría vuestra' (627). This is in contrast to the poem itself when direct references are made to monarchs of the past who brought ruin upon their kingdoms. The statement that the task the couple faces is enormous because 'con mayor dificultad se hemiendan las cosas herradas que se fazen de prinçipio' (626) seems to emphasize that Gómez

Manrique is making a more direct appeal to Isabel and Fernando to consider the gravity of the political situation in which the country finds itself than he does in the poem. He alludes to the fact that he has written his work in verse and explains that he thinks that the medium is more memorable. Since poetry was often written to be recited in public in the fifteenth century, I would suggest that the *prohemio* was not intended for public circulation at the same time as the poem itself.

The *Regimiento de príncipes*

This poem, seventy-nine stanzas of nine octosyllabic lines (629-656), is conceived in the 'mirror of princes' tradition, offering advice to the young prince and princess so that they may prepare themselves to govern wisely before they accede to the throne. The majority of the stanzas are addressed to Fernando, no doubt on the assumption that he would wield greater power than Isabel when she inherited the Castilian crown despite the terms of their marriage contract of March 1469 in which, as J. H. Elliott explains, 'it was made clear that he (Fernando) was to take second place in the government of the country' (Elliott 2002: 22). In the *prohemio* the poet claims to have prepared the necessary material to write a separate poem for Isabel but to have been lacking in 'el saber para le dar forma y el tiempo para la seguir' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 628). Indeed, he seems to have combined both projected poems in this single composition since the content of the advice offered in it to Isabel is certainly very different from that directed to Fernando. When addressing the prince Gómez Manrique promises to speak frankly without flattering Fernando, as he claims that, unlike many who offer advice, he is not seeking favours. His counsel includes references to a range of past monarchs as well as a veiled allusion to Enrique IV, all of whom he holds up as bad examples who have failed to serve their people, together with a warning that Fernando should heed the advice of mature men of experience. This sombre start is tempered with a more positive message when the prince is encouraged to embrace not only the Christian virtues of faith, hope and charity, but particularly those of Stoicism, namely prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude. On addressing Isabel, however, his tone changes: in spite of saying that he will not flatter her, this is exactly what he does, before proffering his advice. This is largely of a negative kind since he uses most of these stanzas to tell her what she should not do and, unlike his words to Fernando, he addresses her in simple language devoid of abstract concepts. This is probably because Gómez Manrique had little idea of how much influence Isabel was to wield once she became queen in her own right. These assumptions about her place in the marriage are

reflected in the *estrena* of two *décimas* he wrote in 1468 when he says of Fernando, 'Este Dios muy soberano / [...] / os haga reyna tenprano, / dándovos rey por marido' (313, ll. 11, 15-16).

Gómez Manrique's Reflections on Rulers of the Past

An analysis of the poem shows it falls into six sections. The first, of seventeen stanzas, begins with references to history in which Fernando is reminded that there have been four previous kings of the same name who have been 'justiçieros, esforçados, / dignos de gran renombre' (ll. 3-4). The poet's wish to speak openly is supported by his assertion that monarchs who have listened to those who flattered them have always brought about their own downfall. He gives examples from the Old Testament and ancient history before speaking again of Spanish history, first alluding to the king Don Rodrigo who, 'mal aconsejado, / perdyó todas las Españas' (ll. 59-60) and then to Pedro I who was known as Pedro el Cruel. All of this justifies Gómez Manrique's attempt to exhort Fernando to avoid 'moços apasionadas' (l. 112) but instead, in order to save the country from disaster, to be guided by men of wisdom, loyalty and discretion. These will be people who will give sound advice and will be guided by reason: 'que con sano coraçón / vos consejen la razón / y tienplen la voluntad' (ll. 115-117), as opposed to those governed by their impulses or desires (*voluntad*) and who seek 'los viçios / y deleytes mundanales' (ll. 122-123).

The Theological Virtues

Gómez Manrique opens the second section, stanzas XVIII to XXIX, with what he considers the most important advice, that he should be well-read, so that he may attain sufficient wisdom to 'dyçerner el byen del mal' (l. 157). The poet makes no recommendations as to what he deems suitable reading matter for a future monarch, but to judge by the content of what follows, he was surely thinking of works with a solid moral content.⁴³ There is a reminder that although he has been born to rule, he should be a faithful servant to the Lord, and should not place too much trust in his might and worldly wealth as did Nebuchadnezzar, king of ancient Babylon, with disastrous consequences. .

⁴³ There is still much here of what has been said about the prevailing culture in the reign of Juan II, an 'almost ubiquitous moralizing note', as Nicholas Round says ; he quotes López Estrada's critique of Pérez de Guzmán as 'un humanismo moral, de raíces senequistas e hispánicas, bíblicas y, por tanto universales' (Round 1962: 204). Taking into account Gómez Manrique's references to Senecan Stoicism, Spanish history and to the New and Old Testaments in this poem, this description seems apt for the *Regimiento de príncipes*.

In the following nine stanzas, XXI-XXIX, the poet asks Fernando to reflect on the three theological virtues of faith, hope and charity. When writing about faith he insists that the prince should have faith in God and think about the afterlife and not follow those who deny its existence if he wishes to achieve salvation (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 196-198). Here, although he is speaking to the prince on the subject of religious conviction, he takes the opportunity to exhort him to punish wrongdoing and thereby avert civil strife. He observes that there are some people who exert themselves ‘por byen byuir’ (l. 223) whereas there are others who do so ‘por no deçendyr / al pozo luçiferal’ (ll. 224-225), thus suggesting a moral superiority in those who opt to live an upright life on principle rather than solely to avoid damnation. This observation leads on to what he has to say about the virtue of hope, namely that it is unreasonable to expect to gain salvation by faith alone and that it is necessary to perform good works as well: ‘mas obras deuéys juntar / con esta tal esperança’ (ll. 233-234). He declares that to achieve happiness is impossible without charity: ‘pues a qualquier miserable / deuéys ser caritativo’ (ll. 248-249) and continues by quoting from I, Corinthians, 13 on the subject of love being the most important of the Christian virtues. These three virtues of faith, hope and charity are thus seen as interdependent.

The Cardinal or Stoic Virtues

In the third section, stanzas, XXX-LIV, devoted to the cardinal or Stoic virtues of prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude, Gómez Manrique appeals to Fernando as an educated man able to handle abstract concepts. On the subject of prudence the poet reminds him again that in temporal matters Fernando should be mindful of the past. He must also be well organised about the present and be provident as regards the future. The poet tends to repeat himself, or at least to expand what he had to say about ‘moços apasyonados’ in stanza XIII, as he wants the prince to take advice from wise and just men, taking into consideration their past character and avoiding those who in their youth were ‘viçiosos, / couardes, neçios, golosos, / amadores de terrazos’ (ll. 290-292).

On the virtue of justice, Gómez Manrique urges Fernando to treat everyone equitably and not to be influenced ‘por amor ni por cobdiçia’ (l. 319) when making decisions. When making appointments he advises against giving them to ‘onbres apasyonados’ (l. 346) and urges him to be generous in his dealings with his subjects: ‘Las penas y los tormentos / deuéys dar syenpre menores, / los galardones mayores /

que son los mereçimientos’ (ll. 352-355).⁴⁴ He wants the afflicted to receive consolation and calls for a balanced attitude towards punishment, with the prince steering a course which is neither overly rigorous nor lenient. The tone of stanza XLI is forthright and indicates a perception on the poet’s part of two character traits he finds unattractive in Fernando. One of these is cruelty: ‘Que ramo de crueldad / es justiçia regurossa’ (ll. 361-362); the other is meanness: ‘dar grandes dones syn tiento / es cosa muy reprouada; / mas mucho menos consyento / que seades avariento, / que peor es no dar nada’ (ll. 365-369). Presumably these lines prompted José María Rodríguez García to comment, ‘he puts his finger on the acknowledged weaknesses of each of the two rulers, such as Isabel’s excessive religious piety⁴⁵ and Fernando’s tendency to extract unnecessarily unjust punishments’ (Rodríguez García 2005: 258).

The same desire to avoid extremes is seen again in his advice on the subject of temperance, for instance in the time spent on leisure pursuits. Fortitude is also considered an important attribute in a ruler and reference is made to the many Christian saints who possessed this virtue, thus showing that Gómez Manrique’s thinking is shaped by a fusion of Christian and Stoic ideals. The theme of the constant conflict between reason and desire (*razón y voluntad*) is raised again with the poet thinking that there is no greater enemy than *voluntad*. The Stoic ideal of cultivating an inner strength to face the moral challenges that life will bring is clearly stated in these lines: ‘que no sé mayor vytoria / de todas quantas leý, / ni dygna de mayor gloria / para perpetua memoria / que vençer el onbre a sí’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 446-450).

Three stanzas of a *Conparación* follow these thoughts on fortitude and the poet uses them to underline his message that Spain needs strong government. He illustrates these verses by making two comparisons between monarchs and members of the animal kingdom. Having said that kings who fear their subjects are not good at meting out justice because they are like lambs fleeing from a fox, he warns Fernando of the danger of being like an insect caught in a spider’s web. The web itself is vulnerable to attacks from more powerful creatures with the result that, ‘asý el flaco varón / mata los que flacos son, / a los fuertes da la vyda’ (ll. 475-477). To avoid comparable situations and to see that justice is done, it is moral courage that Gómez Manrique sees as necessary when he writes that ‘vn coraçón tan constante / es sin dubda menester / que de nada no se espante’ (ll. 482-484).

⁴⁴ On the subject of rewards Gómez Manrique sends Fernando, by now the king, a poem of seven *octavas*, ‘Alto rey esclarecido’ (316-318), because he has not received a falcon that was promised to him.

⁴⁵ I comment on this later in this chapter.

A Definition of True Fortitude

The influence of Stoicism is seen again in a fourth section of six stanzas, LV-LX which is subtitled 'Difinición del esfuerço verdadero'. Here the poet expresses the idea that true effort is not a matter of merely acting fearlessly but in suffering this fear in a selfless way if this is for the greater good. The examples he gives here are not Christian ones but of heroes from antiquity who made the ultimate sacrifice to benefit their people. Death in such situations is seen as superior to living a cowardly or weak existence, the 'byuir menguado' to which Gómez Manrique alludes in stanza LV. In stanza LVII he asserts that such an existence is not worth living when he says, 'pues con menguado biuir / el byuo se torna muerto'. In times of conflict he warns that it takes greater courage to defend one's country than to go to war and conquer since defence is necessary but the need to conquer is not: 'al conquistar al reués / por ser cosa voluntaria' (ll. 521-522), all of which indicates a desire for self-restraint, moderation and diplomacy. Furthermore he sees truthfulness as the basis for friendship and, combined with generosity and graciousness, important for relationships with one's enemies. In so saying Gómez Manrique is surely mindful of the internal strife that exists in the Iberian peninsula and of the two opposing factions, one of which backed Isabel and Fernando as successors to the throne and the other which supported the claim of the princess, Juana, whose paternity was in question. He is hopeful that, by putting these precepts of Stoic thought into practice, Fernando might create for himself a position of real authority. Stanza LX makes the rather optimistic observation that monarchs who are just and frank can flatten obstacles and fortresses for these will always be overcome by 'justiçia con franqueza / y con verdad esmaltada' (ll. 536-537).

Advice to Isabel

The fifth section, LXI-LXXIV, after another invocation for divine inspiration, is directed to Isabel who receives a very different sort of guidance from Gómez Manrique. From what he writes he appears to view her as an overly devout young woman who has been brought up to do little more than to carry out the observances expected by the church. Whereas he offers Fernando food for thought on the principles that should guide his conduct as a monarch, there is no such challenge for Isabel. Although he declares that he will not flatter her when he writes, 'boluerá la mano mía / de toda lagotería' (ll. 551-552), he comments on her traits of character in glowing terms when he says that God made her 'cuerda, discreta, sentyda, / en virtud esclareçida, / buena, gentyl y graçiosa' (ll. 560-562) and also speaks of her physical beauty when he refers to her

‘estrema belleza’ and ‘lynda proporçión’ (ll. 563-564). This is perhaps intended to soften the impact of what follows which is rather negative advice and implies criticism.

The content of his advice is thin and lacks a logical structure. He oscillates between warning against excessive piety and failure in religious observance, interspersing these lines with thoughts on the dispensing of justice. She must guard against excesses that include self-inflicted physical punishment (ll. 577-587), but be mindful that the responsibility of government ‘no se da para folgar / al verdadero regiente’ (ll. 593-594), spending her energies in ruling justly, equitably and without any cruelty. There is an implication that she will be somewhat rigid in making decisions and dispensing justice: ‘señora, guardad / no se mezcle crueldad / con la tal execuçión’ (ll. 601-603). He returns to the subject of religion, urging her to reduce the time she spends in prayer, and instead to devote herself to the work of government in stanza LXVIII. In the very next stanza, however, he warns against using her time in frivolous pursuits rather than in prayer: ‘No dygo que las [oraçiones] dexéys, / señora, por reposar, / por vestyr ni por tocar’ (ll. 613-615). In stanza LXX justice is mentioned again: Isabel’s people will be more concerned about this than about her prayers, but religion is mentioned yet again in LXXI in the context of Isabel’s need to set a good example by respecting both the Church and its clergy.

It is worth noting that Gómez Manrique follows these stanzas with a *comparación* in LXXII, using the word *dechados* in line 640. This word can mean simply ‘example’ but has the sense also of a ‘sampler’ or design for a piece of embroidery that a young girl might be expected to produce to prove herself a good needlewoman. The word *lauores* in the next line was also used in relation to working on cloth in the late Middle Ages and so when the poet enjoins Isabel to avoid ‘dechados / herrados en las lauores’ (ll. 640-641), he is using the simple vocabulary of domesticity which is very far removed from the abstract concepts he uses to appeal to Fernando’s sense of duty.⁴⁶ There follows an appeal to guide her people with discretion ‘por la senda de razón / y no de la voluntad’ (ll. 656-657). In case she was still in any doubt, Gómez Manrique informs Isabel that ‘la razón es una dama / que grandes honores ama / y corre tras la virtud’ (ll. 673-675).

⁴⁶ After Isabel’s accession to the throne this same *dechado* metaphor taken up by Fray Íñigo de Mendoza in his *Dechado a la muy escelente reina doña Isabel* where he makes the comparison between the queen’s duties and the stitching of a sampler (Mendoza 1968, 281-299).

Gómez Manrique's Concluding Words

The final sixth and final section of the four stanzas, LXXVI-LXXIX, is addressed to both Fernando and Isabel with an appeal to them to think about the weighty responsibility that rests on their shoulders. The wealth and honours that they enjoy may bring a bitter aftertaste so, as servants of the Lord, they should love and fear Him if they wish in turn to be loved and respected by their subjects. In his penultimate stanza Gómez Manrique uses a nautical metaphor to compare the writing of this poem to a long sea voyage to express a declaration of modesty: 'quiero salir en la playa / con esta fusta menguada / de los buenos aparejos / para tan luenga jornada' (ll. 697-700).

A striking aspect of this poem and its *prohemio* is the different mode of address that Gómez Manrique uses for the two *infantes*. The Isabel he writes for here bears little resemblance to the Queen celebrated by poets and chroniclers a decade or so later. As we have just seen, he couches his advice in terms of domestic duties and singles out possible failings to guard against: cruelty, frivolity and excess. The only aspect of government that he mentions in his advice to her is the dispensing of justice.

Fray Martín de Córdoba's *Jardín de nobles doncellas*

It is useful to compare Gómez Manrique's mode of address to Isabel with that of another text written before her accession to the throne, Fray Martín de Córdoba's *Jardín de nobles doncellas*. This much longer prose work was written around 1468, before Isabel's marriage to Fernando but after the death of her brother, Alfonso, who had been next in line to Enrique IV. It was also in the autumn of 1468 that Enrique bowed to pressure from Isabel's supporters and declared her to be his rightful successor, rather than his daughter Juana, at an agreement that was reached at Toros de Guisando. The work of Córdoba, an Augustinian friar, owes much to Juan de Castrojeriz's 1344 translation into Castilian and his gloss of Aegidius Romanus's *De regimine principum*. Realizing that the next reigning monarch of Castile will be a woman, something that must have been extremely difficult to accept when the female sex was considered inherently weak, Córdoba sets out to convince male readers, to whom refers as 'menos entendidos', that a woman is capable of governing on the grounds that 'del comienzo del mundo fasta agora vemos que Dios sienpre puso la salud en mano dela fenbra' (Córdoba 1974: 136). We cannot be sure that Isabel ever read this work, which in its *prohemio* addresses her as 'infanta legítima heredera delos reynos de Castilla & León' (135), since no mention is made of it in the extant catalogues of her two libraries (44),

but the fact that a printed edition was produced as early as 1500 (11) strongly suggests that the text aroused considerable interest.

This three-part work opens with a *prohemio* in which Córdoba greets Isabel by saying that he kisses her hands that are ‘dignas de regir las riendas deste reyno (135), thereby immediately showing his support for her as heir to the throne. The subsequent chapters of the first part describe how woman was created in Paradise from Adam’s rib so that the human race would be perpetuated. The benefits of the sacrament of marriage, also instituted in Paradise according to Córdoba, are enumerated (161) and the third chapter ends with a comparison between the Virgin Mary and Isabel. All the faithful should be devoted to the Virgin, but Isabel in particular because they both have the attributes of royal lineage and virginity, and Isabel hopes to become queen, ‘como la Virgen que es Reyna delos cielos, señora delos ángeles, madre delos peccadores & manto de todos los fieles’ (164). This analogy between the Virgin Mary and Isabel foresees a more fully developed comparison in a poem addressed to Isabel by Fray Íñigo de Mendoza. In the final chapter of Part I Córdoba refers to the Aristotelian idea that male children are more likely to be born in cold weather and girls in hot weather (188), but it is noticeable that he omits the philosopher’s belief that the female is an imperfect male, then an accepted basic medical perception

Córdoba did not intend to write a misogynistic tract in the tradition of the *maldezir* but, as Robert Archer suggests, ‘Lo que le preocupa no es la intención de denigrar a las mujeres, sino la idea general que subyace en ese discurso: ¿qué son?’ (Archer 2011: 38). With this question in mind, in Part II Córdoba makes some generalizations about the female sex, reflecting on their good and bad qualities, so that Isabel ‘escoja para sí las buenas y las no tales deseche’ (193). Taking his cue from Castrojeriz who uses three adjectives to denote the good qualities of women: ‘vergonzosas, piadosas e misericordiosas’ (Castrojeriz 1947: 86), Córdoba claims that women are modest or ‘vergonçosas’ because, according to Aristotle, they seek praise and are ‘flacas & temerosas de corazón’ (Córdoba 1974: 193). Their modesty is due to their fear of losing their reputation or ‘vn temor de recibir mengua’ (194). The advantage that he thinks men have over women is that they are endowed with reason which acts as a restraining force when they are faced with the temptation to sin. When considering young women, however, Córdoba resorts to the traditional and misogynistic view of their insatiability: ‘si vergüenza no las refrena del mal & las promueue al bien, yrán como bestia desenfrenada & como caualllo sin espuelas en todo mal; & huyrán toda virtud’ (195). The second good female characteristic is that of piety and thirdly he

considers women to be ‘obsequiosas’ (203), meaning that they are compassionate and kind in their treatment of others. Córdoba lists three major failings of the female sex, the first being intemperance because women are ‘más carne que espíritu’ (210) and are not endowed with the same degree of reason as men, advice that is echoed more discreetly by Gómez Manrique to Isabel (Gómez Manrique 2003: 654, ll. 656-670). Secondly they are excessively talkative and also stubborn, again due to a lack of reason; in addition, they are fickle and inconstant. Another female characteristic that can be good or bad is that women often go to extremes in their actions, something that can be creditable or reprehensible

The aim of Part III is to make recommendations as to how Isabel may overcome her innate womanly weaknesses and fit herself to become queen, one of these being that she should devote ‘algunas oras del día en que estudie & oya tales cosas que sean propias al regimiento del reyno’ (Córdoba 1974: 244). In a further chapter Córdoba admits that although women are naturally ‘flacas & temerosas’, they are able to overcome these characteristics and, if they do so, ‘nunca gigantes osarían atender lo que ellas cometen’ (245). He illustrates this point with the examples of Judith and Holofernes and the stand the legendary tribe of Amazon women took against Alexander. In the third chapter Córdoba advises Isabel that she must take stock of the natural defects she has as a woman and seek to overcome them. Although he previously stated that there were three major defects pertaining to the female sex, here he only deals with two and no mention is made of female intemperance. Isabel needs to say to herself: ‘Las mugeres común mente son parleras, yo quiero poner puerta a mi boca; las mugeres común mente son de poca constancia, yo quiero ser firme en mi buen propósito, que otras fueron ante mí que ouieron grand costancia & por enxemplo de aquéllas, yo quiero ser firme en virtud’ (251). By so doing, although Isabel has a woman’s body, she will acquire the necessary male attributes, or ‘ánimo varonil’ (251) necessary to rule.

Despite this seemingly positive attitude towards the prospect of a female monarch, Córdoba’s writing reflects the ingrained misogyny of his age. His reading of the Church Fathers, such as Augustine and Jerome, whose writings had been studied and disseminated by the Church for centuries, render him incapable of casting off the accepted view of woman as a temptress. He alludes to this concept in Part I of his work when he quotes Saint Ambrose: ‘Que la muger es apta armadura para tomar ánimas’ (154) and in the final chapter of the *Jardín* he contradicts what he has said previously about the female attribute of ‘vergüença’. He disagrees with a certain ‘doctor’ who thought that woman was created to serve man rather than ensnaring him and comments,

‘ella (la mujer) procura la muerte a los varones. Agora por infengidos halagos, agora por lisonjas, agora por hartibles ojadas, estudian de los traer a escándolo de vituperio. En este dicho ha de notar la muger moça [...] que de quantas ánimas de hombres es ocasión de perder, de tantas dará razón el día del juicio; & esto es aella importable, ca harto terná aquel día de dar razón de sí misma’ (283).

Barbara Weissberger sees a close similarity between the attitudes of Gómez Manrique who refers to Isabel’s need to overcome the inclination to cruelty (Gómez Manrique 2003: 652, ll. 602-603), the ‘viçios senzillos’ of frivolity (653, l. 645) and, in the conflict between *razón* and *voluntad*, to make sure that temperance triumphs over excess (654, ll. 656-670), and that of Córdoba: ‘In fact, Manrique’s admonishments to Isabel are strikingly similar to Martín de Córdoba’s in their construction of female virtue as essentially prophylactic, useful for restraining the natural propensity toward excess and vice’ (Weissberger 2004: 57). Two objections can be raised concerning this statement. Firstly, Gómez Manrique makes no generalizations about the attributes of the female sex in this particular poem and actually sings their praises on moral grounds in his *Respuesta* to Torroella’s *Maldezir de mujeres*, going to the length of claiming that some ‘podrían en derredor / el mundo todo regir’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 191-202). Moreover, he makes no attempt at theological discussion on the subject of women and their virtues and shortcomings. Córdoba, on the other hand, writes very much as a member of his religious order and, in the words of Peggy Liss, his work is ‘an extended Augustinian essay on original sin and on the descent of women from the original sinner, Eve [...] who was also held up as the source of all feminine weakness and inferiority’ (Liss 1992: 70). Weissberger also alludes to the fact that Gómez Manrique advises Isabel in stanza LXIX not to neglect her prayers in order to pay attention to her appearance or to rest and urges her in stanzas LXXIV-V to follow the path of *razón* rather than that of *voluntad*, adding, ‘Manrique tries to teach his sovereign [...] that she must work against nature as a woman’ (Weissberger 2004: 58). This may well have been what he was thinking, but he does not say this in so many words. His message on this point is surely similar to the one he offered at greater length to Fernando (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 370-405), namely that the virtue of temperance was very important. Just as Isabel is warned against spending time on frivolous pursuits, so Fernando is advised in stanzas XLIII-IV not to spend too much time amusing himself hunting and playing games (ll. 379-387). Furthermore, when extolling the virtue of fortitude to Fernando, Gómez Manrique first gives examples in stanza XLVII of male role models to follow, and then in the following stanza, surprisingly, an example of female fortitude,

the eleven thousand virgin martyrs who were able to overcome their *voluntades*. Although it should be noted that they were able to do this because of their ‘coraçones / de muy constantes varones’ (ll. 430-431), by using such an example when addressing Fernando, Manrique is surely suggesting that the virtue of temperance is not a purely male prerogative but something for which both men and women need to strive.

Conclusion

With the possible exception of the first work discussed in this chapter, we can be sure that these poems were all written in Gómez Manrique’s mature years during the 1460s and early 1470s. His earlier allegiance to the Aragonese cause no doubt was a factor in his desire to seek peace between Aragon and Castile. Moreover, he had the courage of his convictions, or sufficient confidence in his own position, to state this publicly, realizing that a union between the two kingdoms would make them stronger in the face of those enemies beyond the Peninsula who threatened both nations. Such a union was doubtless a strong motivating force in his desire to negotiate the marriage of Isabel with Fernando which would strengthen the bond still further between the two camps. He was also brave enough to put pen to paper to express his exasperation at the way that he perceived that Castile was being misgoverned, well aware that writing in such a way would arouse controversy. The negative attitude of the *Esclamación* can be contrasted with the optimism of the poem addressed to Fernando after the heroic defeat of the French as he looks forward to seeing Fernando and Isabel as joint monarchs of Castile. Finally, in the *Regimiento de príncipes*, he hopes that Isabel and Fernando will follow the advice that he offers, bringing stability to the unified kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, the culmination of his political endeavours over nearly two decades.

Chapter VI Family Consolatory and Devotional Writing

There are good reasons for believing that one of the last works that Gómez Manrique wrote was, by a long way, the most directly personal. This is the *consolatoria* composed for his wife, Juana de Mendoza, following the death of their two adult children. This was not the first consolatory piece he had written, as some twenty-five years previously he had written an even longer work to console his sister, Juana Manrique, in the midst of the suffering of her family. The two poems, while very different from one another in many ways and written at two such different periods, between them reveal yet another side to Gómez Manrique's poetic personality that we can best examine by taking them together here. It was also in the context of his immediate family that he produced his most important devotional works at different points of his life. These works, representing yet another facet of his poetic activity, are similarly rooted in Gómez Manrique's sense of family identity. For this reason these works will also be discussed here.

The Consolatory Poem for Juana Manrique

'La péñola tengo con tinta en la mano' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 423-447), which bears no title, was composed some time between 1453 and 1458, since stanzas XX-XXI and the gloss inserted between them discuss the downfall and death of Álvaro de Luna (439-440), and in the gloss to stanza XXVIII there is a reference in the present tense to the marqués de Santillana who did not die until 1458 (446). Juana Manrique was married to Fernando de Sandoval, the conde de Castro's son who, like many members of the high aristocracy, had provoked the wrath of Juan II by objecting to the influence of Álvaro de Luna and siding with the infantes de Aragón, Alfonso, Juan and Enrique, whose armies had invaded Castile in 1429. As a result of this, in 1432, Juan II confiscated the lands that had been given to the Sandoval family and distributed them among other nobles who were loyal to him, causing much distress to Juana and her family.⁴⁷ Although Gómez Manrique is writing more than twenty years after this event, it is obvious that Juana is still resentful at what has happened to her family.

The Prose Epistle

The poem is prefaced by a prose *epístola* (419-422) in which he admits that he has delayed in responding to her request for some consolatory verses and he gives more

⁴⁷ Alfonso de Cartagena dedicated his *Doctrinal de los cavalleros* to Juana's father-in-law, Diego Gómez de Sandoval, another link between these two great literary families (Archer 2011: 69-70).

than one reason for this, showing that he is subject to various conflicting pressures in his life. One of these is his concern that the quality of the poetry that he would produce would not be adequate for the subject matter, since she is asking him to do something that is on a higher plain than what he self-deprecatingly calls the ‘trobas de burrla’ (420) that he is accustomed to write. As he does frequently in his writing, he expresses a sense of inadequacy which is reflected in the comparison that he makes between two such different types of writing when faced with the task in question: ‘desmayo en el camino como onbre que, acostunbrado de pasar ríos pequeños en barcas de maromas, se vee en la fonda mar puesto sin remos e vela’ (ll. 20-23). Although the poem is ostensibly destined for his sister, Gómez Manrique realizes that it is likely to be read by other people, some of whom will criticize it. He does not fear positive criticism from those who are well-meaning, but there is apprehension about ‘los escarnios de los maldizientes’ (l. 30), by whom he probably means the political rivals of the Manrique and Sandoval families.

It is out of a wish to please his sister and the fear of being considered lazy or inattentive to her wishes, ‘por haraganía o ynobedieçia’, as he says (ll. 33-34), that he decides to put pen to paper, ‘más de fuerça que de voluntad’, at the same time making excuses for his work which he calls a ‘pagiza obra’ (l. 51), and appealing to her sense of ‘beniuolençia’ (l. 53) to accept it with all its faults. He explains the rather unusual form, since his verses are interspersed with a number of glosses that he has written himself to elucidate some of the references he makes to classical sources and he is mindful of the fact that he is writing this for a woman. Many of these allusions are to stories he presumes to be unknown to women and the difference between the education of men and women in the fifteenth century is reflected in his comment that women like Juana are occupied with ‘la conseruación de la virtud e a la buena gouernación de las casas de vuestros maridos en sus viriles ocupaçiones ocupados’ (ll. 65-67).

The Poem

Gómez Manrique addresses his sister in the more solemn and ponderous *arte mayor* form and, although was an older brother, he writes to her in extremely respectful terms. Rafael Lapesa attributes this to the fact that ‘doña Juana estaba casada con uno de los más ricos hombres de Castilla, mientras que el poeta, a pesar de su nobilísimo linaje, no pasaba de segundón’ (Lapesa 1988: 56). Indeed, the poet actually says that he thinks of his sister ‘en amor sin duda más madre que ermana’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: 423, l.

11) and this is reflected in his mode of addressing her. In his message it is as if he were walking a tightrope between not wishing to offend her and counselling her firmly.

The thirty-stanza poem, in which Gómez Manrique inserts at intervals his own glosses, can be divided thematically into five sections. The first four stanzas are introductory in character and express the poet's diffidence at the task before him. In stanzas V to IX he muses upon the nature of fortune and its effect on the human race. Examples from antiquity, much of them concerning the triumphs of Scipio and his subsequent withdrawal from public life, are given in stanzas X to XVII. Then Gómez Manrique proceeds to remind his sister of events from more recent Spanish history in verses XVIII to XXII and in the final eight he focuses his attention on Juana's own personal situation, urging her to follow a combination of Senecan and Christian teaching and to resign herself to what befalls her.

A quotation from the *Magnificat* in Saint Luke's gospel, placed before the first section (ll. 1-55), sets the tone of the whole work: 'Deposuit potentes de sede et exaltauit humiles' (Luke, 1, 52). This quotation, which 'insinúa la fusión de fortuna en la Providencia de Dios' (Mendoza Negrillo 1973: 112), must surely have been intended to warn Juana that she will need to brace herself morally to read what follows, since it is the loss of her family's power and prestige which so grieves her. This quotation is apposite at the beginning of this poem since it treats the theme of the reversal of worldly fortunes. In Luke 1, 48 the Virgin Mary, referring to herself as God's 'lowly servant', sings the praises of the Lord who exalts the humble and weakens the mighty and powerful. There is surely an intended irony on the part of the poet here, as he suggests that his sister, a woman born and married into the upper ranks of the aristocracy, should reflect upon the words of the Virgin Mary who was not of noble birth, but a role model for all women. He is thus preparing Juana to think of placing less emphasis on worldly values so that she may be able to accept the suggestions that he makes to her in the final section of his poem and become resigned to her circumstances. He does, however, sympathize with the loss of status suffered by her family and in the first verse suggests that what has happened to her is 'según la costunbre del siglo mundano' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 423). In the lines in which he says that the century 'derrueca las casas de cantos e robres, / ensalça las fechas del salze liuiano' (ll. 7-8) the word 'casa' can be understood as 'family', which in turn can be interpreted as an allusion to the way in which some old, long-established, aristocratic families have lost power and influence in the internecine struggles that have taken place and how other families, newly ennobled, have profited.

In his reflections on the nature of fortune in the second section of the poem (ll. 56-132) Gómez Manrique reminds his sister how fickle Fortune can be and how short-lived her benefits. As he ponders the subject of Fortune and the ‘Desdichas e dichas, venturas e fados’ (l. 64) which human beings experience, he concludes that ‘es la Prouidençia del alta tribuna, / avnque los vocablos traemos mudados’ (ll. 66-67). By using these words when discussing man’s fortunes, we can see an attempt to reconcile his Christian belief in the divine will with the prevailing influence of classical and, in particular, Senecan thought and preoccupation with fortune and providence. He asserts his belief that God permits such evils as war to occur because of man’s sinfulness, and elaborates on this in the gloss that follows stanza VI when he says that God’s secrets are ‘ynotos a los muy sabidores, quanto más a los que nonada saben como yo’ (ll. 76-77), thus admitting to a scant knowledge of theology.

In stanza VII Gómez Manrique reflects on the human condition when he remarks that God, in creating man, clothed him not only physically, but allowed him to acquire ‘amargas pasiones, / angustias, destierros e tribulaçiones’ (ll. 86-87). He states that these ‘pasiones’ are our ‘posesiones’ (l. 90) and in the gloss on this verse quotes from the office of the Dead, reminding Juana that our life on this earth is short and full of tribulations. In the following stanza he proceeds to observe that this world with its cares and in which men toil after ‘vanos onores’ (l. 110) is what we inherit from our ancestors and what we bequeath to our children. He ends this verse with two lines in which he uses the metaphor of life being a voyage that is difficult to navigate: ‘pues no nauegamos con más fuertes remos, / nin es nuestra vela de más rezios velos’ (ll. 114-115). The metaphor of the voyage is sustained and developed in stanza IX where Gómez Manrique now sees earthly life in terms of a river that has to be navigated but which is ‘vn gran desuarío’ (l. 139) and assures his sister that past generations experienced the same perils as long as they sailed along this river. He ends the verse by declaring that prosperity and adversity alike are short-lived: ‘pues todas sus ponpas e prosperidades / e sus infortunios e aduersidades / non duran más qu’el blanco roçío’ (ll. 130-132).

The following section of eight stanzas is prefaced by a second quotation from the *Magnificat*: ‘Esurientes inplebit bonis diuites dimisit inanes’ (Luke 1, 53), another reminder that privilege does not always remain with us for life. This section of the poem, stanzas X-XVII, in which Gómez Manrique takes the opportunity to parade his knowledge, is quite a history lesson in itself, as it looks at the reversals of fortune that took place in ancient Greece and Rome and contains the longest glosses, as the poet no

doubt assumes that his sister's education did not take in such subject matter. Without going into detail, he reminds her of the downfall of Troy and the fact that the Greeks were not able to enjoy their triumph over that city due to the many misfortunes that overcame them subsequently; even the great hero Ulysses was only recognized by his old dog, although the poet makes a point of praising the faithfulness of Penelope, the wife of Ulysses, and has no desire to speak ill of women in times past. There is a mention of Julius Caesar and his rivalry with Pompey and then, in the gloss to stanza XIV, an anecdote concerning Caesar's failure to read a note given to him by an old woman who foretold his death on the Capitol which led to his death. Gómez Manrique makes much of the career of Scipio, his campaigns against Hannibal, and the fact that ultimately this hero was obliged to spend his declining years in exile 'desechado de la patria que por su braço redimió' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 346, ll. 347-348).⁴⁸

The fourth section of this poem (ll. 404-479) gives examples from recent Spanish history of two men who met unfortunate ends. The first is 'fijo terçero del rey don Fernando' (l. 413) who was in fact Enrique de Aragón, the son of Fernando de Antequera who was king of Aragon from 1412-16. Enrique was the younger brother of Alfonso V of Aragon and Juan II of Navarre and in Gómez Manrique's words, 'gastó su beuir en poco reposo' (l. 415). Having been made Gran Maestre de la Orden de Santiago at the age of nine, he played an important role in the early opposition to Juan II's reign in Castile in 1420, but was imprisoned and later forced into exile. When he returned to Castile in 1427, he joined his brothers, Alfonso and Juan in declaring war on Castile two years later, but hostilities were averted by the intervention of their sister, María de Aragón, who was married to Juan II of Castile. He spent a second period of exile residing in Naples near his brother, Alfonso V, and again the three brothers were involved in armed conflict in the 'jornada de Ponza' in 1435 where they were imprisoned until the following year. Enrique was back in Castile by 1438 and participated in political struggles which culminated in the invasion of Castile by Aragonese and Navarrese forces. He was wounded at the battle of Olmedo in 1445 and died as a result of this a few weeks later in Calatayud. The gloss that follows stanza XIX is a eulogy to Enrique in which Gómez Manrique speaks of his 'grandísimas virtudes e buenas andanças' (l. 420) and his 'loable vida' (l. 425) and tells us something of the poet's political persuasions in that he praises a man who opposed Juan II of Castile. He also reflects on the way in which Fortune, with whom Enrique had battled

⁴⁸ Perhaps Gómez Manrique was unaware that Scipio behaved as if he was above the law towards the end of his life, refusing to answer charges of corruption and thereby falling from popularity.

throughout his life, finally triumphed over him, since he died and was buried in Calatayud ‘debaxo de las vanderas de Luna que siempre le fueron enemigas’ (ll. 426-427).

Enrique’s life was in marked contrast to the second example Gómez Manrique takes from even more recent history, that of Álvaro de Luna who rose to great power, had so much influence over Juan II, and ‘a quien la Fortuna fue tan fauorable’ (l. 438). In the gloss on stanza XX Luna’s rise from comparatively lowly origins to high estate and his subsequent fall are shown as testimony of Fortune’s ability in which ‘la gran mouilidat de su ley confirmó’ (l. 450). The poet holds this up as a warning to those who seek earthly power and it is noteworthy that he uses the first person plural of the verb when he says, ‘Sin dubda grande ensiemplo a los que tras este fauor mundano corremos deue ser’ (ll. 450-452), intimating to his sister perhaps that the acquisition of lands and political authority is not without its dangers. Furthermore, he doubts if the example of Luna will really serve as a deterrent to others from seeking privilege in the future when he remarks, rather cynically, ‘no cuydo estarían vn momento las sillas de las priuanças vazías sin se arrepentir los que las poseyesen fasta el pie del cadahalso llegar’ (ll. 453-456). His final comments on Luna make it clear that he was opposed to him politically when he declares that justice was done when the *condestable* was executed.

In the final section of this poem (ll. 480-683) Gómez Manrique addresses Juana’s own problems. He starts by praising her personal attributes in verse XXIII, saying that God made her ‘tanto virtuosa, / que pocas se pueden con vos igualar’ (ll. 482-483) and mentions the privileged position into which she was born. In the gloss that follows this he draws her attention to two other highly virtuous women of their family, their mother and grandmother, and flatters her by saying that, even when compared with them, she is still a shining example. This flattery is no doubt intended to soften the impact of his next verse when he declares that Juana is lacking in wisdom in her complaints about her lot, and he urges her to remember that the wealth that she and her family have lost is but a temporal benefit and at the disposal of Fortune herself. He chides her for failing to see that a reversal of fortunes is a challenge to which the virtuous can rise but which defeats the morally weak. He advocates a Stoic resignation to misfortune, particularly for someone of Juana’s position in society: ‘no justo es que nadie por ello sospire, / e menos los nobles de generaci3n’ (ll. 534-535). His tone becomes more severe in the gloss that follows when he asserts that it is reprehensible for those who understand about the vagaries of fortune to complain when they lose out materially and questions whether ‘estos bienes, si tales llamar se pueden’ (ll. 537-538).

Gómez Manrique ends this gloss of stanza XXV by appealing to his sister to rise to the challenge she is facing and to remember that adversity is only bad when you allow yourself to suffer: ‘deue interuenir vuestro gran corazón e reposado seso menospreçiando las tales aduersidades, las quales no son malas saluo a los que las sufren mal (ll. 552-555).

In verse XXVI the poet continues to lecture Juana by declaring that riches and honours should be obtained honestly. He remarks that their loss should not prompt one to change allegiance by saying, ‘mas si las (riquezas) perdieren, / non deuen por esso mudar sus colores’ (ll. 558-559) which is presumably an allusion to the turbulent times in which they were living, when aristocrats would transfer their support to another faction in the hope of preferment or financial gain. After a further reminder of the ephemeral value of earthly wealth, there is another gloss that contains a quotation from Seneca: ‘Nunca fue la nobleza e virtud a perpetua pobreza condenada (ll. 565-567)’. This leads Gómez Manrique to reveal more of his thoughts on the acquisition of wealth and honour by expressing the view, recurring frequently in his writings, that it is permissible to obtain these honestly and with a clear conscience, but that we should not hold these things too dear to us or hold on to them too tightly: ‘mas non deuen fincarlos en los coraçones, e serán sus arcas ligeras de abrir’ (ll. 570-572). Realizing perhaps that he has delivered a sternly Stoic message, the poet concedes that Juana’s heart is not made of stone and recalls not only the sufferings of Job who bemoaned his fate for so long but those of Jesus himself.

From this point on the work becomes more optimistic and consolatory. Gómez Manrique assures his sister that a reversal of fortune such as she has suffered is an opportunity for virtue to shine: ‘que las duras aduersidades ocasión son de virtud’ (ll. 602-603). She should feel strengthened in the knowledge that she is of noble birth and still has many blessings, such as a husband who has brought her no dishonour and a son. The reminder that material wealth does not necessarily bring peace of mind is a reflection of the lawless times in which brother and sister are living when Gómez Manrique suggests that those who now inhabit the house that was once Juana’s may be living in fear. He can think of many people who might be willing to change places with her: ‘que sus reposos, viçios e riquezas por vuestros trabajos, afanes, neçesidades trocarían’ (ll. 649-650). Finally he urges her to thank God for the many benefits He has bestowed upon her and to remain firm in her faith in Him. She must show Christian resignation to God’s will as Jesus did in the garden of Gethsemane. As a final

encouragement, he reminds her of the Canaanite woman in Matthew's gospel whose faith was such that her daughter was healed.

The *Consolatoria* for Juana de Mendoza

The second consolatory poem that Gómez Manrique produced more than twenty years later is especially revealing because it and its accompanying prose epistle discuss a cause of pain so much closer to home. This time the suffering is not due to the loss of status and material wealth such as that endured by his sister, but the death of two of his and Juana de Mendoza's adult children within four months of each other in 1480.

The Prose Epistle

Gómez Manrique opens his letter to Juana (448-453) quoting a saying of Scipio which he remembered from his reading of Livy: 'las cosas pasadas oluidémoslas, y si no las pudiéremos olvidar callémoslas' (ll. 5-6). This allusion seems hardly appropriate here as Scipio was being magnanimous in forgiving and wishing to forget a conspiracy planned against him. In applying this Stoic principle to the deaths of his children, Gómez Manrique says that although he has spoken little about them, and then 'con grant neçesidad de remediar a sus almas' (ll. 13-14), he can never stop thinking about them. As was frequently the case throughout their lives, Juana was absent, fulfilling her duties as *camarera mayor* to Isabel la Católica while Gómez Manrique was in Toledo where he was governor. Not only is the poem intended to bring solace to his wife, but it has also brought comfort to him in the writing. The therapeutic effect of composing this work is thus described by the author: 'porque descansando en este papel como si contigo hablara, afloxase el hervor de mi congoxa, como haze el de la olla quando se sale, que por poco agua que salga auada mucho y ella no rebienta' (ll. 28-31).⁴⁹

He explains that the poem was started shortly after the second death, that of their daughter Catalina, but its composition was interrupted by the illness of Juana when she was attending the queen in Medina del Campo. Her husband was allowed to abandon his duties to visit her early in 1481⁵⁰ and in his letter he explains, interestingly, that he found it hard to return to writing the half-finished work once he returned. He complains that old age has taken its toll on him and that whereas once he could compose 'en vn día

⁴⁹ Harry Sieber remarks that this poem, drawing on Boethius's *De consolacione Philosophae*, 'becomes a conversation between Manrique and his absent wife' (Sieber 1993: 159). Juana's absence makes this an inappropriate comment, but two lines later he says that the poet 'will become the philosopher who teaches Juana through his own learning process' (159), a much more accurate description of the poem's content.

⁵⁰ Paz y Melia gives the text of the letter granting this permission (Gómez Manrique 1886: 316-317); Vidal González also quotes lines from it written in the queen's hand (Gómez Manrique 2003: II, 39).

quinze or veynte trobas', now things are different: 'agora en veynte días no puedo hazer media' (ll. 54 & 56). As so often in his work, Gómez Manrique expresses modesty concerning his literary efforts when he alludes in his letter to 'estas pocas y malas trobas' (l. 72) and further on he says that after a huge effort he finished this piece of work, not as he would have liked but how he was able. He was spurred on to finish the poem on two accounts. One was the memory many years ago of Juana reproaching him for addressing poetry to many other people but never to her. He refers to this time as 'estando en nuestros plazerres' (l. 81) and it brings him some comfort to be able to send her this poem 'en tienpo de nuestra turbaçión, por señal de amor' (ll. 84-85). The second motivation for finishing the poem was the deaths of two children of the marqueses de Moya around the same time. He refers to the marquesa de Moya as 'llagada de la misma llaga que nosotros' (ll. 88-89). Otherwise known as Beatriz de Bobadilla, this lady was close to Isabel la Católica and obviously a close friend of the Manriques, and to whom Gómez Manrique professes himself 'tan afiçionado' (l. 87).

The Poem

The poem, of thirty-four octosyllabic *décimas*, falls into three sections, the first comprising stanzas I-XV which form a *prohemio*, almost half the entire work, and introduce us to the subject matter with an intimation in the first stanza that he has brought this suffering upon himself through his 'pecados' (l. 109). The language is highly resonant of pain with its allusions to a 'llaga' that is 'tan cruda' (l. 111) and 'tan dolorida' (l. 114), to his 'amargas afliçiones' (l. 119) and 'las lágrimas caýdas' (l. 130). He questions how he can provide Juana with any consolation: '¿Quién hablará con el ñudo / que se haze en la garganta?' (ll. 133-134), but realizes that suffering brings wisdom: 'así da sabiduría / la congoxa y ansiedat' (ll. 151-152), and this in turn will help him to express himself, albeit in verse which will be 'apasionado' (l. 155), or full of pain, rather than well written. He asks whom he will invoke to inspire him in this task and allows himself to make various references to classical mythology but rejects them all. Instead, he will ask God's help and makes an interesting comment at this point when he declares, 'Pues iré al Hazedor / de los çielos estrellados / que supo hazer letrados / de ombres desenseñados, / syn escuela ni dotor' (ll. 198-202).

There follow three stanzas in which the poet admits that he needs help to carry out this task, reflecting what he has said in his letter to Juana about the length of time it now took him to compose twenty lines. He returns to the very concrete images related to practising the skill of poetic composition that we saw in his verses to Juan de

Valladolid: ‘que las gruesas herramientas / con que yo forjar solía / esas obras que hazía, / non de alta policía, / todas están orinientas’ (ll. 228-232). Both time and sadness have blunted these ‘tools’. The last of these three stanzas is a simile in which he compares himself to a restless horse unwilling to compete in a race because he has lost the habit of writing verses.

Stanzas XVI-XXIV form the second section of the poem and begin with the author’s expression of anguish at the thought of his wife’s distress. Gómez Manrique then sets out his Stoic beliefs very much as he did to his sister over twenty years previously, namely that human beings frequently mistake good for evil and vice versa. He observes that it would have been natural for Juana to have desired a more aristocratic status for her son, but how much better it was that their son should have died ‘en su lecho, / confesado y satisfecho’ (ll. 290-291), rather than having brought his own misfortune upon himself through excessive riches and ambition like the Duke of Viseu.⁵¹ Conversely, those who have erred often turn away from evil and reform their way of life, which leads Gómez Manrique to declare, ‘Pues no tengamos por males, / ni se pueden llamar tales, / estos que nos hazen buenos’ (ll. 310-312).

Influenced no doubt by his reading of Seneca, in stanza XXII Gómez Manrique realizes that premature death need not be a cause for sadness since those who die young may be spared misfortunes and their fame and honour will not be forgotten. In his letter to Marcia Seneca tells her, ‘Think how great a boon a timely death offers, how many have been harmed by living too long!’ (Seneca 1932: II, 71), citing the example of Pompey who survived illness in Naples only to be assassinated later in Egypt. In addition, he comments, ‘To your son, therefore, though his death was premature, it brought no ill; rather has it released him from suffering ills of every sort’ (73). Combining these Stoic sentiments with Christian teaching, he echoes the words of comfort from Luke 6, 21 for the sad and distressed: ‘llama bienaventurados / a los llorantes cuitados, / y dize que consolados / an de ser de neçesario’ (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 329-332). The final verse of this section conveys the traditional Christian message that we should resign ourselves to the sorrows of this world in order to enjoy the ‘dulçuras’ (l. 341) of the afterlife.

The third section (ll. 343-442), which opens with the rubric ‘Consolaçión fundada sobre razón natural’, tells us that excessive outpourings of grief are futile since

⁵¹ The ‘duques portugueses’ (l. 271) are almost certainly the Duke of Guimarães and the Duke of Viseu. The former was found guilty of conspiring (allegedly with some encouragement from the Reyes Católicos) against João II and executed in 1483; the latter was murdered by João II’s own hand in 1484, also because he was plotting against him (Disney 2009: I, 135-136).

the dead cannot be resurrected. Building on what he has already said about premature death in stanza XXII, Juana should take comfort from the thought that, had their children lived longer, they might have been overcome by worse misfortunes: ‘de muerte más cruda / nos podría Dios llevar / al hijo sin confesar, / y si pudiera dexar / aquella hija biuda’ (ll. 358-362).

Gómez Manrique then unburdens himself on the subject of his own guilt in a sort of *mea culpa*, since he is convinced that the deaths of his children are God’s punishment for his sins, although he refrains from enlarging on what these are. Juana’s grief has doubled his own distress and he asks how she can be consoled by the one who is the cause of their misfortunes: ‘¿cómo serás consolada / por la mano matadora?’ (ll. 401-402). Since it is inevitable that Juana suffers through his own deserved punishment, he hopes that God will be especially merciful to her.

In the final two stanzas he draws consolation from his Catholic faith, quoting from the Sermon on the Mount: ‘Hijos de Dios llamarán / a los que fueren paçientes’ (ll. 426-427). The thought that they have no living children prompts him to observe that there has been a reversal in their roles: ‘¡O qué troque tan llenero, / si bien pensar lo queremos: / pues que hijos no tenemos, / que de padres nos tornemos / hijos de Dios verdadero’ (ll. 428-432).⁵² Having formerly been their children’s ‘anteçesores’, they become their ‘subçesores’ (ll. 438 & 442) in the next world.

An Exchange of Letters between Juan de Lucena and Gómez Manrique

The extent to which Gómez Manrique’s *consolatoria* for Juana was actually an exercise in Stoic self-consolation for terrible grief can be gauged by examining the correspondance between him and Juan de Lucena (Carrión, ed., 1978: 565-582). This exchange of letters probably took place at the end of 1480 or early in 1481, since there is no mention of Juana’s illness or the visit her husband was permitted to make to her in Medina del Campo in the spring of 1481. The only mention of Juana is when Gómez Manrique tells Lucena that he wrote to the queen ‘por incitar más su virtud para la consolación de mi muy amada muger’ (579). Lucena was a priest who, having lived for a spell in Rome, returned to Spain. He undertook diplomatic missions for the Catholic monarchs and probably became acquainted with Gómez Manrique at court.

Bearing in mind the comparatively recent deaths of three members of the Manrique family, Lucena begins his letter by praising the poet for the example of

⁵² In fact they had another daughter, María, a nun, of whom Gómez Manrique says, ‘biua se me enterró’ (Carrión, ed., 1978: 578).

fortitude he has set: ‘Y estos tan arrebatados males que la herida del vno sanaua la llaga del otro, vuestra forçada prudencia los supo y pudo tan bien tollerar que solo vos entre todos érades ovido por prudente’ (575).⁵³ He adds that there was need to recall the Stoicism of classical writers in the face of adversity when they had Gómez Manrique as a role model in their presence. All this has changed now and, using a military metaphor, he takes him to task for failing to maintain his serenity after Catalina’s death: ‘que en la lucha y en la pelea, havn que vna o dos o más vezes deruequen a su luchador, si enflaquecido cahe a la postre, no gana el precio de fuerte’ (575).

Lucena continues by accusing Gómez Manrique of being weak and effeminate: ‘asý vos mostrays fembra, regando la cara con lágrimas, con las vnyas rasgando las hazes’ (575), and likening his reaction to that of Job in his misfortunes. Amongst other examples, he reminds him of Cato’s bravery in performing his duties immediately after the death of his only son and continues by saying that many people forget their grief in a short space of time. He tells him to cease mourning, to behave not as those without belief in the afterlife, but instead to remember that ‘partiremos desta vida que muere para nos hallar puestos en la que nunca muere y juntos en aquella espaciosa y más que espaciosa ciudat de nuestro Dios moremos siempre con Jesu Christo (576).

Gómez Manrique admits to finding himself in a quandary as to whether he should reply to this letter; couching his response in language with frequent images reflecting his military past, he begins by comparing himself to a cowardly knight who cannot decide whether to launch himself into the fight or flee the battlefield, since he would either appear discourteous or expose his weakness. It is plain that he is offended by the letter and, wishing to refute its ‘infamias’ (577), he tells Lucena, ‘no vos marauilleys por que me quexe de vos y alabe a mí’ (577). He speaks of the cumulative effect of his children’s deaths coming after that of his brother and nephew: ‘aquellas afliciones cuyos rastros, havnque no poco ni mucho ni nada desfechos, algo estauan rematadas o holladas de las postreras esquadras del dolor de las muertes de los hijos’ (577). He denies indulging in lamentations as Lucena has accused him, but having ministered to his daughter in her final days ‘en tan gran soledat’ (578), he admits to having shed ‘algunas demasiadas lágrimas que la humanidad no pudo resistir’ (578) and reminds Lucena that even Jesus was reported to have wept on several occasions. Using the language of war again, he describes his heart as ‘lombardeado de las gruesas piedras’ to the extent that ‘no fuera marauilla que con esta cayera en los yerros de que

⁵³ Gómez Manrique’s brothers Rodrigo and Fadrique died in 1476 and 1479 respectively. His nephew, Jorge, also died in 1479; Lucena appears to think that Jorge was Fadrique’s son rather than Rodrigo’s.

me culpays' (578) because even an experienced jouster can fall after suffering previous setbacks.

Gómez Manrique describes how, despite being physically weakened after this latest tragedy to the extent that: 'obe de estar dos días en la cama que apenas me podía rodear', he roused himself sufficiently to go about his business 'porque no se atribuyesse la disposición de la persona a flaqueza de corazón' (579). He ends his letter saying that he has two reasons to complain to Lucena, firstly because he accused him wrongly. Secondly, as a 'tan indocto cauallero' defending himself against Lucena, whom he generously calls 'otro Tulio', he is forced to praise his own behaviour, which is 'ageno de toda virtud' (580). Despite his indignation, Gómez Manrique thanks Lucena for writing to him, graciously remarking, 'mejor señal de verdadera amistad son las amorosas reprensiones más que las demasiadas alabanzas entre los verdaderos amigos' (580).

Other Poems for Juana de Mendoza

The *consolatoria* was not the only poem Gómez Manrique addressed to Juana. There are at least two other works, both very different generically.⁵⁴ One of these is a ten-line *estrena*, the first two lines of which express his devotion to Juana with a surprising degree of hyperbole: 'Amada tanto de mí / e más que mi salvación' (Gómez Manrique 2003: 295). This is not the love of courtly verse of which he wrote a great deal in his youth, but perhaps an appreciation of her in later life which, he explains, is 'más por la virtud de ti / que por ninguna pasión' (ll. 3-4).

The other poem, requested by Juana, is one of several religious compositions on the subject of the Virgin Mary entitled 'Los cuchillos del dolor de Nuestra Señora puestos en metro por Gómez Manrique a ynistançia de doña Juana de Mendoza, su muger' (283-287). The poem consists of fifteen verses of *octavas* which are based on a traditional way of saying the rosary, recalling seven incidents in the life of the Virgin that brought her great sorrow. The 'cuchillos' or 'wounds' are the events in Jesus's life that caused her suffering, most but not all of which are authenticated in the gospels. The first four verses of the poem are introductory and in praise of Mary and her purity.

In the fifth verse Gómez Manrique describes the first 'cuchillo' that Mary experienced when Jesus was presented at the Temple and Simeon prophesied that her son would bring her great sadness, telling her, 'qu'el infante / vn cuchillo muy tajante /

⁵⁴ Another poem, of twelve lines, 'Vyéndovos tanto penada' (117) may also have been composed for Juana de Mendoza as its content echoes that of the *consolatoria* addressed to her.

te sería' (ll. 38-40). This is a reference to Luke's gospel (2, 35) and also alluded to in the *Representación del Nacimiento de Nuestro Señor* as discussed above. The second wound, in stanza VI, is founded on Matthew's gospel which tells us that Joseph learned in a dream that he should flee with Jesus and Mary to Egypt because Herod was intent on killing the child. The following verse, again based on Luke's gospel (2, 41-50), refers to the occasion when Jesus, at the age of twelve, remained in the Temple and caused his parents great anguish because they thought that he was lost. Jesus's arrest, the fourth wound, is the subject of stanza VIII and the fifth, in stanza IX, is an allusion to the account of the crucifixion according to John's gospel (19, 26-27). On seeing his mother and the disciple, thought to be John the evangelist, standing at the foot of the cross, Jesus said, 'Dear woman, here is your son'. The deposition from the cross is the subject of stanza X and Mary's participation in Jesus's burial that of XI. In the latter Gómez Manrique departs from the account found in the gospels which recounts that it was Joseph of Arimathea who buried Jesus, and according to John's gospel, he was helped by Nicodemus. This departure from what is written in the gospel has to be seen as poetic licence in order to convey the intensity of Mary's grief.

Stanza XII, the first of the four final verses of the poem, praises Mary for her fortitude and it is interesting to note how this is described, the implication being that this is not a typically female characteristic: 'y la tu pura flaqueza / femenil / fue conuertida en veril / fortaleza' (ll. 93-96). The final three verses form a prayer to the Virgin in which Gómez Manrique asks that she may save him from damnation and help him not to sin in thought or deed. In the last verse Mary is addressed as 'Entera consolación / en nuestros grandes conflitos' (ll. 113-114), demonstrating that she is seen as a source of comfort for that afflicted.

The style of this poem is reminiscent of much of Gómez Manrique's love poetry. The use of the *pie quebrado* in the sixth and eighth lines, causing an interruption of the metrical form, helps to emphasize the feelings expressed. In the first stanza, for example, '¡O Virgen senper intacta, / por quien dixo Salomón: / "Pura donzella", / toda eres toda bella / en perfección!' (ll. 4-8), Mary's purity is underlined and the rhyme of 'perfección' with 'Salomón' reminds us of Solomon's wisdom. The use of the *pie quebrado* is also used in combination with antithesis to heighten the dramatic effect of the poem. An example of this is in the quotation from stanza XII in the paragraph above where 'femenil' (l. 94) rhymes with 'veril' in the next line and 'flaqueza' (l. 93) with 'fortaleza' (l. 96). Anaphora is another figure of speech found in stanza XIV with the

repetition of 'Líbrame' at the beginning of the first and fifth lines when the poet is praying to the Virgin that she may guide him away from sin.

The two Juanas were not the only members of the poet's family to enjoy the fruits of his literary efforts.⁵⁵ The family was very devout and two of his sisters became nuns at the Franciscan convent at Calabazanos which was founded by their mother, Leonor de Castilla. One of these sisters, María, asked Gómez Manrique to write a nativity play for the nuns to perform.

La Representación del Nasçimiento de Nuestro Señor

This short play (660-674), written for the nuns to perform at Christmas, can be dated to some time between 1458 and 1468, since the dedicatory rubric states that it was written 'a instançia de doña María Manrique, vicaria en el monesterio de Calabazanos' (660). This community of *clarisas* moved to Calabazanos in 1458 (Surtz 1983: 19-20) and in 1468 María was promoted from *vicaria* to the position abbess (Gómez Manrique 2003: 660n). The play is seen by scholars as marking an important point in the evolution of medieval theatre, since traditionally any religious dialogue was very much part of, and linked to, the celebration of the liturgy and was based on close reference to biblical material. At Christmas, for instance, an *Officium pastorum*, an enactment of how the shepherds received the news of Christ's birth, and their visit to Bethlehem, might be inserted into the liturgy. The *Siete Partidas* of Alfonso X had stipulated that a church was intended as a house of prayer, but certain dramatic activities were permitted: 'Pero representaciones ay que pueden los clérigos fazer así como de la nascencia de Nuestro Señor Jesu Christo en que muestra como el ángel vino a los pastores, e les dixo como era Jesu Christo nacido. E otrosí de su apareción como los tres Reyes Magos lo vinieron a adorar [...]. Tales cosas como estas que mueven al ome a fazer bien e a aver devoción en la fe pueden las fazer (Álvarez Pellitero 1990: 23-24).⁵⁶ In the words of Álvarez Pellitero, 'la pieza significa un enriquecimiento en comparación con el enjuto esquema del *Officium pastorum* (108-109).

There are six scenes, the first of which opens with an *octava* spoken by Joseph lamenting the fact that Mary has been unfaithful to him since she is expecting a child which is not his. There is a hint in Matthew's gospel concerning Joseph's doubts: 'Because Joseph was a righteous man and did not want to expose her to public disgrace, he had in mind to divorce her quietly' (Matthew, 1, 19) and his misgivings also feature

⁵⁵ Other family members who received poems were his aunt, the condesa de Castañeda (298-299), his brother Rodrigo, the conde de Paredes (300 and 308-312), his sister-in-law, the condesa de Paredes (301).

⁵⁶ Ana Álvarez Pellitero quotes from Alfonso X's *Primera partida*.

in some of the apocryphal gospels (Gómez Manrique 2003: 660n). Not only is Joseph portrayed as apprehensive, but also as ignorant, when he declares in the final two lines of this verse, ‘dizen que d’Espíritu Santo, / mas yo d’esto non sé nada’ (ll. 7-8). In the second stanza of the scene Mary prays to God that Joseph may be made aware of the truth, saying, ‘alunbra la çeguedad / de Josep e su sinpleza’ (ll. 15-16). The following verse is spoken by an angel who appears to Joseph to reassure him of Mary’s purity, reminding him of Isaiah’s prophecy. Gómez Manrique’s angel also sees Joseph as an ignorant and short-sighted man since his opening words are, ‘¡O uiejo de munchos días, / en el seso, de muy pocos, / el prinçipal de los locos!’ (ll. 17-19). Mary is the pivotal character in this scene, coping with the dual role of young Jewish woman married to a humble man, and mother of the Saviour of the world whose reputation in the eyes of her husband is saved only by the appearance of an angel. The depiction of Joseph as an ignorant and foolish elderly man is found elsewhere in medieval European literature, as Johan Huizinga observes when writing of the fourteenth-century French poet, Eustache Deschamps: ‘The curiosity with which Joseph was regarded is a sort of reaction from the fervent cult of Mary. The figure of the Virgin is exalted more and more and that of Joseph becomes more and more of a caricature’ (Huizinga 1965: 163).

Appearing alone after the birth of Jesus in the second scene, Mary expresses her devotion to God and repeats part of the Magnificat, part of the response she made to the angel at the time of the annunciation. In the third stanza Gómez Manrique departs from the details of the nativity story known in the canonical gospels and portrays Mary as already aware of her son’s destiny which is to redeem the sinners of this world by his own sacrifice. According to Luke’s gospel, however, Mary and Joseph had no intimation of what was to come until Jesus was presented in the Temple and Simeon blessed the family. Speaking to Mary of the child’s future importance and his destiny in life, Simeon ends by saying, ‘And a sword will pierce your own soul too’ (Luke, 2, 35). Ángel Gómez Moreno, like Surtz (1983: 21), suggests that here the play shows that it was written for a community of *clarisas*, the female branch of the Franciscan order, due to ‘el influjo de la espiritualidad franciscana [...], evidente en la yuxtaposición del Nacimiento y la Pasión de Cristo’ (Gómez Moreno 1991: 86). The juxtaposition of Mary’s joy at the birth of her son and the pain that his death will cause her highlights the nobility of her soul as she vows to bring up her child with due reverence and endure the suffering that his death will bring her with no loss of faith.

The third scene follows the story of Christ’s birth according to Luke (2, 8-17) with the announcement to the shepherds. Gómez Manrique embellishes the story, first

by adding a brief conversation amongst the shepherds, depicted as simple, rustic people, and then in the fourth scene we see them in the presence of Jesus, each one speaking a verse of seven lines in praise of the child, this time in language of a more cultivated register. In the fifth scene three angels appear and declare their devotion to Mary: Gabriel who will be her loyal ambassador, Michael who will accompany her and Jesus, and Raphael who will be her page-boy and who echoes the words of the Ave María, saying, ‘¡O mater Christe, / bendicha entre las mugeres!’ (ll. 127-128).

Scene VI, allegorical in form, looks to the future martyrdom of Jesus. It is introduced in an *octava* by the chalice which, foretelling Jesus’s act at the Last Supper, tells the infant that he must drink from this cup in order to save the human race. The instruments with which he is humiliated and tortured at the crucifixion are personified and each speaks briefly. They are the rope that tied Jesus to a column, the whip with which he was lashed, the crown of thorns, the cross, the nails and finally the lance which pierced his side when on the cross.

The final scene takes the form of a lullaby, in the metre of the *zéjel*, with the title *Callad fijo mío chiquito*, sung by the nuns as they address the infant. That this is no ordinary lullaby, however, is made clear in the first line which reads, ‘Callad vos, Señor, / nuestro redentor, / que vuestro dolor / durará poquito’ (ll. 161-164), an obvious reference to Christ’s manhood and death. In the second verse there is an appeal to the angels to console the child, suggesting that the infant is aware of his destiny. The third verse alludes to Israel’s captivity in Egypt and their exodus from that land: ‘Este santo dino, / niño tan benino, / por redimir vino / el linaje aflito’ (ll. 173-176), an example of typology, since the Old Testament account of the children of Israel’s delivery from bondage prefigures the New Testament’s narration of Christ’s redemption of the human race. The lullaby ends joyfully with the nuns encouraging each other to sing since they are all ‘esposas / del Jesús bendito’ (ll. 179-180).

In an article on this play Harry Sieber stresses the importance of the dramatic structure and symmetry of this work (Sieber 1965: 118). He observes that the play is structured in such a way that scenes including three characters are interspersed with a scene or scenes in which a sole character performs a monologue, until the sixth scene where the chalice and six allegorical figures representing Christ’s martyrdom appear. His article contains four diagrams to illustrate this symmetry which he considers to be of great importance, but I would argue that the way in which Gómez Manrique introduces the themes of birth, death and devotion, and shows how closely they are linked one to another, does not depend on an appreciation of the numbers of characters

who appear in each scene. What seems more pertinent is how the focus of the play oscillates between two realms, the spiritual and the temporal, particularly in the first four scenes. In another article, Stanislav Zimic seems to exaggerate the importance of Joseph's role in this play: 'Cada escena es una reconvención a la sospecha de José' (Zimic 1977: 369) and 'José no representa sólo al individuo [...] sino a todo aquel segmento de la humanidad que se manifiesta escéptico ante el Misterio Divino' (378). This claim is rather far-fetched since he makes only one brief appearance in the first scene and no further reference is made to him.

As already mentioned, Mary is caught between her two roles in life; she has to answer to her husband on the temporal level, but also, on the spiritual level, to God as the mother of Jesus. The intervention of the angel in the first scene makes it clear that Mary is where these two worlds meet. This contrast between the temporal and spiritual realms is also found in the language of the scenes where the shepherds appear in Scene III. While their response to the angel's announcement of the birth of Jesus is couched in everyday parlance, in the presence of the infant Christ in Scene IV, Gómez Manrique makes them speak in a different register to demonstrate their reverence and their awareness of the important event they are witnessing: 'Dios te salve, glorioso / infante santificado, / por redimir enbiado / este mundo trabajoso' (Gómez Manrique 2003: ll. 81-84). The significance of the event is further emphasized in the next scene with the appearance of the three angels who express their devotion to Mary as mother of Christ. In scene VI the temporal and spiritual worlds meet when the allegorical representation of the chalice, symbolizing Christ's ultimate sacrifice, speaks first and is followed by the personification of each of the material objects that inflicted his torture and death in his earthly life. The *Cançión* of the final scene draws together the themes of birth, death, devotion and salvation, all of which have been treated in the play.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ The theme of salvation is treated in three other poems. In the *Coplas fechas para la semana santa* (674-678) the Virgin Mary appeals to men and women of all three estates to join with her in grieving since Jesus died to redeem them. In the second scene Saint John echoes what she has said and adds a reminder that Judas, who betrayed Jesus, should also be mourned. In the third scene John tells Mary to be courageous and accompany him to the place where Jesus is buried. The language of this short piece is highly charged emotionally with much use of anaphora. Devotion to the Virgin Mary is the subject of *Loores e suplicasiones a Nuestra Señora* (287-293), seven *décimas* emphasizing her purity and mission on earth as the mother of Christ, who will redeem us from the slavery of sin. One *décima*, the *Troba fecha a Santo Tomé* (282), is dedicated to the doubting Thomas. The tautology '¡O qué duda tan dudosa / fue la de Santo Tomé!' (ll. 1-2), declares that the Resurrection should never be doubted. Antithesis in the third and fourth lines demonstrates that by showing he doubted, Thomas enabled the doubters to strengthen their faith. The three verbs, 'nasçió', 'murió' and 'resçuçitó', in the past tense, emphasize the poet's belief in these events, whereas the final verb of the poem, 'resurgiremos', rhyming with 'dudemos', in the future tense, affirms Gómez Manrique's belief in the afterlife.

Conclusion

A striking feature of the two consolatory poems is how the personal and public aspects of the Manrique family's lives seem to be inextricably linked. This is particularly true in the case of the poem written for Juana de Mendoza which, while it was inspired by a profoundly emotional reaction to personal tragedy, contains references to current political events in Portugal. One can only conclude that even what seems to us a deeply personal matter, concerning the poet's immediate family, cannot be separated from the shifting, and often treacherous, world of politics, revealing how intensely public they felt their lives to be. Moreover, Gómez Manrique found he had to defend himself against the criticisms of Lucena which appear to have been founded on rumour, another intimation that his private life was minutely scrutinized. Despite all this, the poet's faith, demonstrated in his devotional writing, as well as his Stoic convictions, appear to remain unshaken.

Conclusion

Gómez Manrique stands out from his contemporaries as a poet in several ways. Where countless others would have abandoned verse outside the context of courtly practices, Gómez Manrique turned poetic composition into a meditative and expository tool with which to address many facets of his complex and unceasingly difficult existence. Certainly his poetic trajectory could be said to follow a fairly foreseeable pattern for an early modern nobleman who managed, against all odds, to reach old age: love poetry as a young courtier, elegies for dead comrades, and then the turning to moral and devotional themes in his mature years, exploring, in his case, a combination of Christian and Senecan ideas. But while his productivity as a poet spans so many years, there is little sense that poetry was for him a purely literary endeavour, or an attempt to emulate the great literary models of his age, or that he wrote with one eye on the judgement of posterity. On the contrary, he presents himself as a man of his time, of the political moment, or of the immediately lived experience of his contemporaries. These aspects mark him out from other more talented and learned poets like Santillana or Mena.

In general terms, he would have seen himself as supporting the ongoing collective project of some members of the nobility and more lowly placed *letrados* in his century and the decades before it to claim the right to engage in moral and meditative discourse in the face of the dominance of clerical literacy. He would have learned early from his relative the marqués de Santillana, whom he admired greatly, that there was no reason why the courtly and military areas of expertise that he developed should be mutually exclusive, and this is reflected in his known work: a sizeable body of courtly love poetry alongside a substantial volume of more weighty and varied compositions. He realized, however, the difficulties of combining arms and letters in practical life: there are occasions when he regrets that his military or political commitments do not permit him the leisure to extend his wide reading further or even to retain, let alone develop, his skills in poetic composition. Perhaps it is because of these difficulties that literary emulation, or even the desire to distinguish himself as a writer, does not seem to be at the forefront of his ambitions.

Rather, what is evident in his work is almost always a pragmatic and dutiful engagement through verse with the events and issues that confronted him at every turn. This is certainly the primary specific function of the writing of verse for Gómez Manrique. For him poetry, supported sometimes by prose, was the vehicle for an

intellectually based public response to the events in his own political, military and family life, and of evaluating the issues that arose from them.

Debate with others would have been a second function of verse-writing for him: there are numerous compositions of this kind, some of them trivial, but others on major issues of his time such as the nature of true nobility, discussed by him with three correspondents, or the substantial and influential reply to Torroella's misogynistic *maldecir de mugeres*. Verse was also a platform from which to promote his own political views. This was particularly relevant in the turbulent times of fifteenth-century Castile, and Gómez Manrique took the opportunity to stir up controversy when he disseminated in his *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación* his accusations of what he saw as rampant corruption and maladministration. It does not seem too much of an exaggeration to suggest that this aspect of his writing was a kind of fifteenth-century forerunner of what today we term social media. His verse sometimes performed a fourth function too: that of writing for the sake of family members, notably in times of crisis in order to console them, but also to offer them devotional works for their own use.

It is precisely because the first three specific functions I have identified above are so publicly oriented that an understanding of the social, political and economic background in which Gómez Manrique lived and wrote is so fundamental to an appreciation of his work and the interpretation of it. He was born into one of the most aristocratic Castilian families whose motto, 'Non venimos de reyes sino los reyes de nos', derives from the fact that his mother was descended from Enrique II of Castile, and it tells us a good deal about how the Manriques viewed their position in society. Times, however, were changing and the fortunes of many long-established families suffered various vicissitudes, often brought about by their own rebelliousness. An example of this is Gómez Manrique's sister, the condesa de Castro, which is why he addressed a consolatory prose epistle and poem to her. On the other hand, when Gómez Manrique found himself in 1460 living in the archbishop of Toledo's household, commanding Carrillo's private army, he came into contact with a number of men who were not of the same social class but with whom he appears to have enjoyed engaging in debate, and this was a very fruitful period in his literary life. Social class and politics were inextricably linked: Enrique IV's promotion of recently ennobled men had caused resentment among the old aristocracy, not least Gómez Manrique. Then came the sudden and unexpected death of the infante Alfonso and the constitutional crisis which arose with the prospect of a woman on the throne, a question in which he found himself

deeply involved and which ultimately resulted in his composition of the *Regimiento de príncipes*.

This inextricable link between real events and his trajectory as a poet makes it all the more important to attempt to consider his work, as I have done here, within a chronological framework, albeit a loose one. This framework allows us to trace the development of his thought and the changing nature of his preoccupations. The early work, consisting of love poetry offers little thematic interest and is typical of a young knight wishing to carve out a courtly identity by displaying basic poetic skills, skills which he developed and refined over the course of his production in great metrical variety and the deployment of an extensive range of rhetorical resources. The elegy for Garcilaso, is an expression of his respect for a man of his own class who paid the ultimate sacrifice in a campaign against the Moors. In this poem Gómez Manrique simultaneously casts an image of himself as both a knight who was present at the battle, and as a poet who is able to write an elegy that reveals an acquaintance with classical literature. Near the end of it the first glimmering of his disapproval of the favouritism of Enrique IV towards men of lower rank can be detected, reflecting the beginning of a transition to politically oriented writing. This disapproval is more apparent in the *planto* for Santillana, very probably written a few years later. Here, while he develops the genre of elegy further within an ambitious allegorical framework and focuses on his homage to Santillana's literary legacy, we find allusions to what the poet considers to be the deteriorating political scene in Castile due to the lack of men of integrity, such as the *marqués*, in positions of power and influence.

It is when Gómez Manrique joins the household of archbishop Carrillo that his literary output of substantial works really begins to increase, and there is growing evidence of his intellectual curiosity. Mixing with a number of men who were *letrados*, most of them *conversos*, and who did not therefore share the same preconceptions, he engages with them on a wide variety of subjects. Perhaps most pertinent of all is the exchange on the nature of true nobility in which his correspondents assert that it is a quality not automatically passed down from one generation to the next. The fact that it was Gómez Manrique who initiated the discussion strongly suggests that he was beginning to question the assumptions of his own class on this matter.

It was also during this period of his career that he began to write at greater length on moral issues. Surrounded by other men of letters, he aspired to complete Juan de Mena's unfinished *Debate de la Razon contra la Voluntad*, an ambitious project in which he claimed, like the other poets who wrote continuations to Mena's poem, the

right to discuss the religious and ethical matters which not so many decades before might have been the province of clerics alone. This phase of his career saw the composition of what many judge to be his finest poem, the *Coplas para Arias Dávila*, also a work with a strongly moral theme. Before the end of his time with Carrillo there came the radical change of tone we see in the *Esclamación e querella de la gouernación*, a manifestation of what is by now his anger and frustration.

The need for diplomacy as a way to solve Castile's problems, however, carried greater weight than the urge to rebel and cause havoc. A tension starts to arise between the persona of what Round has termed the 'warring grandee' and the '*caballero sabio*' that he had by then become in the eyes of his contemporaries. It manifests itself, for instance, in the way he lauds the young Garcilaso for launching into a skirmish and yet, in his continuation of Mena's *coplas* on the seven deadly sins, he allows Razón to remind Envidia that war is the cause of much devastation and personal tragedy.

This tension was resolved in Gómez Manrique's mature years when he channelled his energies into his role of statesman and felt justified, on account of his ancient and distinguished lineage, in advising Isabel and Fernando on how to conduct themselves as monarchs in his *Regimiento de príncipes*. His patriotism is reflected in this poem as he looks to the future, hoping to see justice, peace and social cohesion, the lack of which had previously motivated him to write the *Esclamación*. Another ideological tension can be observed in Gómez Manrique's writings at various points in his poetic production: the anti-Semitism that manifests itself in his dealings with Juan de Valladolid. We can only assume, perhaps, that the friendships he cultivated with other New Christians were founded on a belief that they were sincere in their conversion.

This thesis has involved a great deal of close analysis of Gómez Manrique's poetry. What have we learned from engaging with it in such detail? In the first place, I hope it reveals how carefully structured and considered much of his work is, how closely it responds to and interweaves with the ideas of a good number of his contemporaries who rarely expressed themselves at such length. It is from such detail that we acquire a better sense of the intense intellectual and ethical engagement of Gómez Manrique with whatever concrete event urged him to write, or whatever abstract concept the event called up in his well-stocked mind.

We end up with a sense of how, whether he was writing on the most important matters of state, debating ideas in quick exchanges, keeping his hand in as a producer of courtly love lyrics, advising princes, denouncing the contemporary problems of Castile,

or consoling a family member by reflecting on the vagaries of fortune, verse composition was an activity that was an essential part of his existence, not an acquired adornment to it or an attempt to achieve literary fame. Nephew of Santillana, admirer of the great Mena, he must have been well aware of his limitations. I have made no claims for Gómez Manrique as a great poet; that is not the point. As the large body of his surviving work testifies, verse was a life-long practice that wove its way into nearly everything he did, or at least nearly everything we know of him. He was something quite different from his more illustrious poetic contemporaries: an assiduous and skilled writer of verse who thought that no vital aspect of the world he found himself in was unworthy of poetic composition and who for that reason kept writing until the end.



Frontispiece to the 1505 Cromberger edition of the *Coplas de los siete pecados mortales*

Appendix

Olivares's continuation to Juan de Mena's *Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntad* and his corrections and additions to the original text have been neglected by scholars. When Gladys Rivera published an edition of Mena's poem with the continuation by Gómez Manrique in 1982 she expressed the intention of producing an edition of the two other continuations by Pero Guillén de Segovia and Jerónimo de Olivares, but this has not been realized. Brian Dutton was aware of the existence of Olivares's continuation, referring to it as 05*MP-2, but only includes the *incipit* and *excipit* in *El cancionero del siglo XV: c.1360-1520* (ID 4093, Dutton: 1990-1991: vol. 5, 99). I have examined three editions of Olivares's work: one included in a 1548 edition of Mena's work printed in Toledo and another in an Anvers edition of the complete works of Mena dated 1552. The earliest edition of Olivares's work that I have found is that referred to by Dutton and contained in a volume bearing the title of Mena's poem. It was produced in Seville and is thought to date to around 1505 (Griffin 1991: 307). An edited version of Olivares's continuation of the poem is given below, together with the prologue that Olivares wrote, the corrections that he made to Mena's text, and his glosses.

The glosses that Olivares composed and intercalated into Mena's poem are highlighted and numbered with Arabic numerals. Arabic numerals are also used for the continuation by Olivares. Mena's stanzas are numbered with the same Roman numerals as in Vidal González's 2003 edition of Gómez Manrique's complete works which mainly follows the text of the manuscript MP3, which I reproduce here. It will be noticed that Olivares has changed the order of some of these verses and I have retained this. He indicated his corrections with the sign “)(“, but I have replaced this with an asterisk. He did, however, make other corrections to Mena's text which are not indicated, perhaps through the fault of the typesetter, and these I have also marked with an asterisk. His corrections and other textual variations from MP3 are indicated in footnotes. I have made a few corrections to what appear to be typographical errors in 05*MP-2 and these are explained in footnotes. The *apparatus* includes only major variants, ie. those where different words are used which could alter our interpretation of the text.

Tratado de vicios y virtudes, hecho por Juan de Mena, glosado y acabado por fray Jerónimo de Olivares, cauallero de la orden de Alcántara.

Ésta es vna adición hecha en verso por fray Jerónimo de Olivares, cauallero de la orden de Alcántara. En la qual corrige en estilo, y yguala en coplas, y acaba aquella muy insigne obra de vicios y virtudes, que el famoso Juan de Mena començó. E porque los letores conozcan en que lugares entra lo qu'el dicho fray Jerónimo hizo, lo del estilo señala antes de verlo assí . XX . E sus coplas márcalas assí de su nombre (Jerónimo). E a las de Juan de Mena pone el suyo assí (Juan).

El prólogo.

[L]eyendo⁵⁸ muchas vezes aquella obra del nuestro poeta Juan de Mena, intitulada de vicios y virtudes, que por ser atajado de la muerte no acabó, assí por él, como por ella, mucho pesar sentí. Y como pensasse que obra tan insigne de alguno sería acabada, hallé que el muy honrrado y sabido cauallero Gómez Manrique, sintiendo lo que yo, se puso en dalle fin. Mas como dél cargassen muchos cargos y negocios, no teniendo aquel reposo que para ello convenía, poco pesar de no auerla su dueño acabado me quitó. Assí mesmo vi hecho otro fin por vn Pero Guillén, gran trovador (a mi ver) mas no sabiendo yo dezir por qué no fue el fin suyo tal que algo del pesar sentido me quitasse. Lo qual me hizo muchas vezes pensar de añadir vn tercero fin a la dicha obra. E como entonces con más cuydado y consideración la mirasse, vistos los traços della e lo pintado, con mayor confusión e temor quedé, que de aquellos que pensaron acabar la començada pintura del famoso Apeles. Pues assí con esto en mi pensar reboluiéndose lo vno y lo otro, ni negar sabía, ni afirmar osaua. En fin, que en tal agonía apartándome a lo más solo la voluntad e la razón eran en contínua guerra, y allí sin yo saberlo dezir, vn varón se me mostró, que atajando mis pensamientos, con boz e tono diuerso de nosotros, me dixo: ‘La gana y affición que a mis obras tienes, quasi de tu padre heredadas, me trae de entre aquellos que la beatitud esperan, para rogarte que lo que pensauas poco ha, lleves adelante’. Yo con turbación grande marauillándome, le respondí: ‘Por aquella gloria que esperas, te conjuro me declares lo que dizes’. Él veyéndome assí, sonriéndose dixo: ‘Yo soy Juan de Mena, y escucha. Como te viesse desseoso de añadir vn fin en la mi obra de vicios y virtudes, y mal satisfecho assí como yo de los fines que en ella viste, vengo suelto por pequeño espacio de purgatoria cárcel, a mostrarte e persuadirte, que assí como esto has pensado, lo pongas en effecto. Para lo qual quiero que sepas que, biuiendo nos tu padre y yo, mostrándole aquella mi obra, y

⁵⁸ 05*MP-2: Aeyendo (editorial amendment)

preguntándole lo que d’ella le parecía, después de mucho auerla loado me dixo: “Que pues yo metía en campo para batallar la Razón y la Voluntad, que mirasse quán injusto era meter en la liça la vna muy acompañada de coplas e la otra casi sola.” Yo teniéndole en merced la tal corrección e auiso, propuse emendarlo como después hize, quando del vicio de la yra traté. Mas como Atropos cortasse ya la tela, no solamente aquello quedó por fazer, mas avn el estilo del consonar: que en quinze partes quedó errado, limar no pude como la arte pedía. Por tanto no te me escuches, diziendo quantos trobadores aya agora, que assí en estilo como en la materia te harán mucha ventaja. Ni menos me pongas delante el tiempo mal dispuesto para aquestas cosas, ni la insufficiencia tuya: pues allá do estamos ninguna cosa se nos esconde.’ Yo no sabiendo qué responderle, el temor perdido sabiendo quién era, gozoso corrí abraçarlo. Mas él, no sé porqué no consintiéndolo, con muchas fuerças amonestándome conjuró, que yo quisiesse corregir el estilo de lo errado, y henchir ygualando la Soberuia, Auaricia, Luxuria, en coplas con la Razón: y después acabar aquella su obra assí como yo primero desseaua. A esto respondí, que bien que a él contentasse con mi trabajo y satissfiziesse, avnque no con mi sufficiencia, que más auía que hazer, porque los letores no contentos, y con razón, con dientes iniquos y lenguas biuoreznas detrayendo, me roerían por auerlo fecho. ‘Porque tal no temas’, dixo él, ‘yo quiero fablar contigo muchas cosas para en aquesto, protestando que si licencia ouiere, yo te visitaré en la forma que yo estaua quando escreuía.’ Entonces a mi oreja llegado con vn aliento que todo me penetró, informándome de muchas cosas, otro hombre me hizo: y con tanta fuerça fueron, que no fue en mí dexar de poner en obra su querer. Y en este punto me desapareció. Por tanto si yo como nuevo hombre allende de los comunes algunos yerros cometiere, a la voluntad de cada vno dexo que me culpe como querrá, pues yo a lo que me es mandado curo proceder más que a desculparme, para lo qual assí como él la gracia y diuina ayuda pidiendo, digo.

I

Canta, tú, cristiana musa
la más que çeuil batalla
qu’entre Voluntat se falla
y Razón que nos acusa;
tú, graçia de Dios infusa,
recuenta de tal vitoria,
quién deue llevar la gloria
pues el canpo no se escusa.

*Despide las musas gentiles, pues á
inuocado la cristiana*

II

Fuyd o callad, serenas,
qu'en la mi edat pasada
tal dulçura enponçoñada
derramastes por mis venas.
Mis entrañas qu'erán⁵⁹ llenas
de peruerso fundamento,
quiera el diuinal aliento
de malas fazer ya buenas. 16

*Proemiza e, por los indiçios de la
muerte, dispone la correpción de la
vida*

III*

Venid lisongeras canas,
que tardáys demasiado;⁶⁰
tirad presunçiones vanas
al tienpo malgastado;
faga mi nueuo cuydado
a mí que biuo entender,
inçierto del bien fazer
y del mal certificado. 24

Conpara e aplica

IV

Como casa envegeçida
cuyo çimiento se acuesta,
que amenaza y amonesta
con señales su cayda:
si así la nuestra vida
es contino amenazada,
¿por qué será salteada
de muerte tan comedida?⁶¹ 32

Continúa

V*

La vida pasada es parte
de la muerte aduenidera⁶²,
y es pasado por est'arte
lo que por venir s'espera.
¿Quién non muere antes que muera?,
ca la muerte no es morir,
pues consiste en el beuir,
mas es fin de la carrera. 40

VI

Estas canas que me niegas
estas rugas sin virtud,
el mal que con la salud
a menudo á grandes bregas;
las vistas turbias e çiegas,
deserradas las enziás,⁶³
joyas son que nos enbías
tú, muerte, quando te llegas. 48

Castiga el tienpo malgastado

VII

No se gaste más paulo
en saber quién fue Pagaso,
las dos cumbres de Perrnaso,
los siete braços de Nilo:
pues no llegamos al hilo
y sabemos que de nos
juzgando recibe Dios
más la obra qu'el estilo. 56

*Retrata las obras vanas fasta aquí
fechas*

VIII

De fuerte alabo a Tideo,
a Lucreçia de muy casta,
a los biuos no me basta,
que a los muertos lisongeo.
Digo males de Tereo,
a Egisto reprehendo,
mis grandes uiçios defiendo,
y los agenos afeo. 64

⁵⁹ 05*MP-2: quedan

⁶⁰ 05*MP-2: Ya tardáys demasiado / venid
lisonjeras canas

⁶¹ 05*MP-2: conocida

⁶² 05*MP-2: De la muerte aduenidera / la vida
passada es parte The order of this stanza and the
next is reversed in 05*MP-2.

⁶³ 05*MP-2: descarnadas las enziás.

IX

A Dido con otras gentes
infamo muchas vegadas;
loo mal en las pasadas
por que yerren las presentes;
tiro los inconuinientes
con ensienplos de maldades;
las onestas⁶⁴ voluntades
de sanas fago dolientes.

72

*Arguye de dos semejanças***X***

Amarillo faze el oro,
al que sigue su minero,⁶⁵
y tenblador el tesoro
del azogue al del venero.
Pues si del bien verdadero,
tenemos alguna brizna,
fuygamos lo que nos tizna
como la fragua al ferrero.

80

XI*

Çese nuestra fabla falsa,⁶⁶
de dulce razón cubierta,
qu'es así como la salsa
qu'el apetito despierta;
luxuria no nos conuierta
en bestial inclynación;
lo que guía el afición
las menos vezes açierta.

88

*Redarguye las poesías***XII**

Avnque muestre ingratitud
a las dulçes poesías,
las sus tales niñerías
vayan con la jouentud;
remedio de tal salud,
enconada por el viçio
es darnos en sacrificio
nos mesmos a la virtud.

96

XIII

Mas por eso no se entienda
que no quiero ser vezino
de las que al santo camino
nos guían por justa⁶⁷ senda;
cúnplenos en tal fazienda
vsar de sabia cautela:
a vnas dar del espuela,
a otras tener la rienda.

104

XIV

Vseamos de los poemas
tomando d'ellos lo bueno,
mas fuygan de nuestro seno
las sus fabulosas temas;
sus fiçiones y problemas
desechemos como espinas;
por auer las cosas dinas,
rompamos todas sus nemas.

112

*Comparación de la vieja ley***XV**

Primero seyendo cortadas
las vñas e los cabellos,
podían casar entr'ellos
sus catiuas aforradas
los judíos, y linpiadas,
fazerlas ysraelitas
puras, limpias y benditas,
a la su ley consagradas.

120

*Aplicación a la poesía***XVI**

Del esclaua poesía
lo superfluo así tirado,
lo dañoso desechado,
seguiré su compañía;
a la cathólica vía,
reduziéndola por modo
que valga más que su todo
la parte que fago mía.

128

⁶⁴ 05*MP-2: humanas⁶⁵ 05*MP-2: Al que sigue su minero / amarillo haze el oro.⁶⁶ 05*MP-2: De dulce razón cubierta / cesse nuestra habla falsa⁶⁷ 05*MP-2: recta

XVII

Pero con sermón onesto
quiere la pura intención
el que mira el corazón
y no juzga por el gesto;
si verdat es todo esto,
en ello parando mientes,
dexemos los inçidentes,
boluamos a lo propuesto. 136

Despedido del proemio, da forma a la obra

XVIII

A qualquier viçio que incline
la Voluntad y lo siga,
la Razón lo contradiga,
la Prudencia determine;
pues, de aquí se vos asine
por vuestro⁶⁸ jüez Prudencia,
por que por la su sentençia
nuestra vida s'encamine. 144

Figura la forma de la Voluntad

XIX

Con muy diforme figura
la Voluntat apareçe,
a desora mengua y crece
la su forma y estatura;
penetra con catadura
de siete caras y bocas,
todas feas, si no en pocas
desonesta fermosura. 152

Figura la primera cara de la Soberuia

XX

Muy altiua y desdeñosa
vi la su primera cara,
inflada, turbia, non clara,
sin causa siempre sañosa;
oras tristeza ponposa⁶⁹
con turbio gesto mostrando,
a las vezes declarando
potestad presuntuosa. 160

Figura la segunda cara del Avariçia

XXI

Sotil y magra, fanbrienta,
mostró la cara segunda,
menguada de quanto abunda,
de bien ageno sedienta,
espía sotil, esenta
de la ganancia escondida,
lo que a otros da la vida
a esta sola atormenta. 168

Figura la tercera cara de la Luxuria.

XXII

Mostró la cara siguiente
pintada de fermosura,
d'empoçoñada⁷⁰ pintura
como cuero de serpiente;
de fuera toda la frente
inflamada como fuego,
los ojos en mal sosiego,
la boca por consiguiente. 176

Figura la quarta cara de la Yra

XXIII

Con los dientes regañados
demostró su quarto gesto,
a todo daño dispuesto,
sus sentidos alterados;
los sus ojos derramados,
procurando la vengança,
desechada la tenprança
y sus actos oluidados. 184

Figura la quinta cara de la Gula

XXIV

Con goloso paladar
e los carrillos rellenos,
nunca se nos quiso menos
la quinta cara mostrar;
deque⁷¹ la vi deleytar
en el apetito puro,
avnque quisiera, a Epicuro
non lo pudiera oluidar.⁷² 192

⁶⁸ 05*MP-2: nuestro

⁶⁹ 05*MP-2: pensosa; Toledo 1548: penosa

⁷⁰ 05*MP-2: ponçoñosa figura

⁷¹ 05*MP-2: desde

⁷² 05*MP-2: avnque quisiera Epicuro / no la pudiera oluidar

Figura la sesta cara de la Envidia

XXV

Muerta con agena vida
la sesta cara matiza
de color de la çeniza,
traspasada y carcomida;
de sus ojos conbatida,
de bien ageno doliente,
y mal de buen açidente,
sana y de dentro podrida. 200

Figura la setena e postrimera cara de la Pereza

XXVI

Soñolienta y desgrena
vi su cara postrimera,
nigligente, mal granjera,⁷³
no bruñida, ni afeytada;
difforme, muy maltratada,
fecha a sí mesma enojosa,
buscando la vida oçiosa,
sin trabaxos trabajada. 208

Admiración del autor

XXVII*

Turbado de la figura,⁷⁴
de tan difforme chimera,
en mí non touo mesura
la firmeza que quisiera;
alterome de manera
la su difforme visión,
que mi gran alteración
qualquiera la conoçiera. 216

Conparación

XXVIII

Como el vando quebrantado
en esfuerço más se esmera
quando asoma la vander
del socorro deseado,
así fue yo consolado
quando vi muy de rendón⁷⁵,
las señas de la Razón
asomar por el collado. 224

Conparación

XXIX*

Como el sol claro relunbra
quando las nuves desecha,⁷⁶
atal la Razón acunbra
contra nos a man derecha;
Voluntad luego s'estrecha,
vista la su fortaleza,
ca do mengua la firmeza
temor creçe la sospecha. 232

Conparación

XXX

Fizo tal alteración
con los sus falsos visajes,
qual fazen⁷⁷ los personajes
quando les falleçe el son;
la su medrosa intinçión
por sus caras destribuye,
quanto más ella refuye
más se açerca la Razón. 240

Declara más la propyedad de la Razón

XXXI*

La su relunbrante cara⁷⁸
y su gesto cristalino
reparten lunbre muy clara
por todo el ayre vezino;
tanto que pierde su tino
la Voluntad, y lo quiebra,
como quien de la tiniebra
a nueva lunbre se vino. 248

XXXII

La Razón, desde llegada,
remirando las fechuras
d'aquellas siete figuras
fue muncho marauillada;
e como viese indinada
la Soberuia en presumir,
començole de dezir
con habla muy sosegada:⁷⁹ 256

⁷³ Toledo 1548: malgraciada

⁷⁴ 05*MP-2: De tan difforme chimera / turbado
con su figura

⁷⁵ 05*MP-2: rondón

⁷⁶ 05*MP-2: Como el sol claro desecha / las
nuues quando relunbra

⁷⁷ 05*MP-2: quedan

⁷⁸ 05*MP-2: El su gesto cristalino / y su
relunbrante cara

⁷⁹ 05*MP-2: reposada

Fabla la Razón contra la Soberuía

XXXIII

“¡O mayor mal de los males!
¡O enferma humanidat!
¡O vmana enfermedat,
yerro común de mortales!
Soberuía que sobresales
con tu presunçión altiua,
y vanagloria catiua,
dañas mucho y poco vales. 264

Continúa la fabla

XXXIV

“Soberuía, ¿por cuál razón
detienes a los vmanos,
con tus apetitos vanos⁸⁰
con tu loca alteraçión?
Guíaslos a perdiçión
por tus caminos aviesos,
pues para tantos eçesos
¿quién te da la sujestión?” 272

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

1⁸¹

“Tú, Razón, te desonestas
en tus hablas y preguntas,
pero en esto que tú apuntas
no son lexis mis respuestas.
A tus dichos y requestas
respondo sin muchas pausas,
que por solas cinco causas
soy qual vees, y son éstas. 280

Responde la Soberuía señalando çinco causas donde ella naçe

XXXV

“El saber me da⁸² inflaçión, (Juan)
la belleza, esquiuidat,
la riqueza, altiuedat;
el linage, presunçión;
pobreza, con reliçión
tocada de gloria vana,
me faze mostrar sin gana
gran desdén al afeçión.” 288

Responde la Razón a la primera causa, del saber

XXXVI

“A gran locura te cuento
si por ser tú gran letrado
as de andar todo finchado
como odre lleno de viento.
Sea el tu fundamento
en saberte moderar,
ca el saber no á de tirar,
mas poner muy mejor tiento.” 296

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

2

“El saber m’ensorberuece,
pues no puede ser negado
que deuo ser tan honrrado
quanto mi saber merece.
Al letrado pertenece
con autos y contenencia,
gloriarse con la sciencia
do tanto bien permanece. 304

Prosigue

3

“No me puedes tú negar
según la razón tenemos,
ca los que mucho sabemos
no nos deuan más honrrar;
por lo qual yo deuo estar
como tú dizes inflada,
pues la cosa qu’es loada
cresce con verse loar.” 312

La Razón concluye (Juan)

XXXVII

“Antes el tal desuario,
del saber es muy ageno;
ca por mostrarte más lleno,
te juzgan por más vazío;
pues si sabes, doma el brío
por que con tu saber quepas;
si non sabes, por que sepas
tenprar caliente con frío. 320

⁸⁰05* MP-2: “en tus pensamientos vanos”.

⁸¹ This stanza is attributed to Mena in Anvers 1552 but does not exist in MP3; it is spoken by Jerónimo in 05*MP-2

⁸² 05*MP-2: El saber vieda inflaçión

Responde la Razón a la segunda causa

XXXVIII

“Dizes que la belleza pueda
dar de ti desdén atal;
si piensas qu’eres mortal,
desfarás luego la rueda;
Prouidençia nunca queda,
ca nos fizo de terruño,
tal que nos funde y da cuño
de nueuo, como a moneda.” 328

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

4

“Con belleza y hermosura
no quieres que me glorie,
pues, ¿do te plaze qu’embie
estos bienes de natura?
Si desto no hazes cura,
tu pensar no sé qué piensa,
pues de hermosura immensa
gloriarme no es locura.” 336

Continúa

XXXIX

“Lo sujeto a corruçión (Juan)
y a casos de fortuna,
deue ser, sin duda alguna,
muy quito de presunçión;
pues la hermosa façión,
que por ti tan presto pasa,
nunca tú de su vil masa
te fagas muncha mençión.” 344

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

5

“Con tus pensamientos peno
que van fuera de ti misma,
dexas, y hazes sofisma,
lo qual de ti es muy ajeno;
contigo mi hecho ordeno
que según es ya sabido,
por discreción es auido
del tiempo tomar lo bueno.” 352

XL

“Breue don es fermosura (Juan)
por poco tienpo prestado;
en momento arrebatado
se fuye toda fygura;
no es ora tan segura
ni día tan sin enojo,
que no robe algún despojo
de la fermosa fechura.” 360

6

“Tú me das causa qu’estime (Jerónimo)
la beldad y que la precie,
y que a ti propia desprecie
y al nombre tuyo m’arrime.
Quando belleza s’emprime
hallo qu’es bien de gozalla,
y no después dessealla
que el desseo me lastime.” 368

Prosigue

7

“Pues no me hagas creer
que tal opinión es yerro,
por lo qual aquí me cierro
pues no te puedo entender.
La hermosa forma y ser
es ocasión que m’esquie,
qu’entre la gente que biue
no quieren otro querer.” 376

La Razón concluye (Juan)

XLI

“Fue tu forma condenada
por quitar tu presumir,
do la ora por venir
es peor que la pasada;
fázete graçia⁸³ callada
la mala como la buena,
por trabajo ni por pena
non se te descuenta nada.” 384

⁸³ 05*MP-2: guerra

Habla la Razón contra la tercera causa

XLII

“Si dizes qu’eres altiue
porqu’en riqueza abundas,
dígote que tú te fundas
sobre caso muy catiue;
consintiessése el motiue
que altiue te fiziesen,
si en este mundo pudiesen
por siempre fazerte biue.” 392

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

8

“Tanto más, menos t’entiendo
quanto más te cato y miro;
siempre seré con sospiro
si en riquezas no m’estiendo.
Si los santos más teniendo
fueron sus glorias más luengas,
yo no sé por do sostengas
que yerro tal presumiendo.” 400

9

“Pues no culpes mi altiue
porqu’en riquezas abunde,
que todo el mundo confunde
al pobre triste raez.
En mocedad y en vejez
quiero de rico renombre,
pues tal honrra dan al hombre
que hallan qu’es su jaez.” 408

10

“Con los bienes de fortuna
tengo honrra, tengo fama,
tengo mesa, tengo cama,
sin faltar cosa ninguna.
Con tantos bienes soy una
muy altiua con lo mío,
e por tanto me glorio
viéndome en alta tribuna.” 416

XLIII

“¿Bienes pueden ser llamados (*Juan*)
los que come la carcoma?
¿O los que la muerte toma
todos por descaminados?
Los bienes muy acabados
de su dueño no los parte
la muerte, por ser con arte
de virtudes abraçados.” 424

XLIV

“Antes digo que se deuen
llamar obras muncho vanas,
y ocupaciones vmanas
que toda codicia mueuen.
¿Pues por cuál razón s’atreuen
a dañar tu voluntad
con su loca altiuidat
por do todos te reprueuen?” 432

*Responde la Razón a la quarta causa,
del linaje*

XLV

“Dizes qu’eres generoso,
que no te falta costado
y que faze en el estado
ser altiue y desdeñoso;
si tú fueses virtuoso
y de noble fidalguía,
tu fundamento sería
mansedumbre con reposo.” 440

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

11

“No sé yo modo ni abrigo
con que pueda contentarte;
qualquier parte es peor parte
avnque la prueue contigo.
Al qu’es de linage antigo
no le quites que no quiera
en todo la delantera
con enemigo y amigo.” 448

Compara

12

“Que como el aue sin pluma
mal enseña su coraje,
assí el hombre sin linage
es cerca de nos espuma;
por lo qual mucho mahuma⁸⁴
tu parlar que se va en humo.
Si de quién soy no presumo,
¿de qué quieres que presuma?” 456

⁸⁴ Anvers 1552: “ma’huma”.

Dize la Razón (Juan)

XLVI

“De muy gran tiniebra ofusca
las leyes de gentileza,
quien no faze la nobleza
y en sus pasados la busca;
quien de sangre muy corrusca
se socorre faze falla,
como quien vua no falla
anda cojendo rebusca.” 464

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

13

“No juzgues las nuestras greyes
como a las otras naciones,
quies tratar a los leones
como se tratan los bueyes:
a los hidalgos y reyes
conuiene lo que tú huyes;
y si contra aquesto arguyes,
mal has visto nuestras leyes.” 472

14

“Pues por aquesta ocasión
al buen linaje conuiene
que muestre quién es: do viene
con obras de presumpción:
y que reciba ambición
de la su progenie antigua;
esto razón lo testigua,
pues tú, no huyas, Razón.” 480

Continúa la Razón (Juan)

LXVII

“¿Quieres saber el prouecho
que de nobleza se siga?
Es contrato que te obliga
a ser bueno de derecho;
si no responde tu fecho,
nin tus fechos⁸⁵ tú no domas,
lo que tú por onrra tomas
se conuierte en tu despecho.” 488

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

15

“Tu pensar, según s’entiende,
mucho va lexos del nuestro;
si altiuo yo me muestro
justa razón lo defiende;
si el hidalgo se deciende
de quien es a ser más llano,
el vulgo rudo y villano
en hazerlo nos offende.” 496

16

“Pues no quieras que dexemos
nuestro processo antiguado;
si la verdad has mirado
poco yerro cometemos:
con esto nos mantenemos
en honrra y cauallería,
y con esta hidalguía
defensamos y offendemos.” 504

Dize la Razón (Juan)

XLVIII

“Ca non solamente basta⁸⁶
que vengas de noble gente;
la bondat de la simiente
tu soberuia te la gasta;
e la virtud se contrasta
que por el linage cobras,
si no responden tus obras
a la tu buena casta.” 512

XLIX

“Quando⁸⁷ tú más ensalçado
te fallares, si te catas,
quanto más llano te tratas,
tanto más eres amado;⁸⁸
porque así en grand estado
vmildat da fermosura,
como la gentil llanura
en la cumbre del collado.” 520

⁸⁵ 05*MP-2: vicios

⁸⁶ 05* MP-2: Non solamente te basta

⁸⁷ 05*MP-2: Quanto

⁸⁸ 05*MP-2: honrrado

Determina e prueua por conparaçión

L

“Soberuia cae syn mina,
los mansos tienen la cunbre,
derriba la mansedunbre
lo que la Soberuia enpina;
el vmilde que se inclina
es planta que se traspone,
quanto más fondo se pone,
tanto creçe más aýna. 528

*Responde la Razón a la quinta causa,
de la riligión presuntuosa*

LI

“Dizes que de religioso
te fuelgas con vanagloria
y publicas gran estoria
del tu beuir virtuoso;
desdeñas lo criminoso,
lo mundano menospreçias,
y solamente te preçias
de ser santo desdeñoso.” 536

Responde la Voluntad (Jerónimo)

17

“Ninguno podrá culparme
que incite a nadie a pecar;
deues más considerar
quanto desprecio el jatarme:
tú misma deues loarme
por tal vía qual contemplo,
que siendo del bien enxemplo,
avn no quiero gloriarme. 544

18

“Yo no cobdicio lo ageno,
ni me altero, ni m’ensaño;
yo jamás no hago daño,
y a todo el mundo soy bueno.
Con el mal de todos peno,
con el bien de todos biuo;
seyendo caritatiuo
a todos meto en mi seno. 552

19

“Yo ayuno, yo me abstengo,
yo huyo del qu’es dañino,
yo me humillo y disciplino,
yo por mis males por bien tengo;
yo al yglesia voy y vengo,
siendo día y avn ascuras,
e si me vienen pressuras
con paciencia las sostengo. 560

20

“Y pues vees la razón:
tú, Razón, no me condenes,
ni con mis bondades penes
qu’es malina condición.
Yo merezco galardón,
yo huyo los alborotos,
y a los que son indeuotos
prouoco a gran deuoción. 568

21

“Dirás, la candela fina
quemándose nos alumbra,
ya si tu vida relumbra
entre la gente mesquina;
si tu nombre t’encamina
antes deuo ser loado,
pues Jesús crucificado
nos impuso en tal dotrina. 576

22

“Cúlpasme de vanagloria,
yo no sé quién es sin ella;
quanto más huyamos d’ella,
más se lança en la memoria;
assí penetra su escoria,
qu’en aquesta triste vida
pensando auerla vencida
lleua de nos la vitoria. 584

23

“Y pues la habla se ordena
cerca de aquesta materia;
según la humana miseria
es mi vida la qu’es buena.
Si gloria se da por pena
yo espero el bien superno;
y si no, yo no discierno
si ésta es vana cuál es llena. 592

24

“En el próximo pecar
prohibió la ley de Dios;
pues no quieras qu’entre nos
d’esto te puedan culpar.
Preciaste de adeuinar
del bien juzgando peor;
lo que es interior
nadie lo deue juzgar.”

600

Habla la Razón (Juan)

LII

“No quieras más estender
ya esto dentro en tu seno;
querrías ser visto bueno
no curando de lo ser;
y avnque quieras bien fazer,
por buenas obras que fagas,
todas ellas las estragas
con el tu ensorberueçer.

608

Prosigue más

LIII

“Que las malas obras crezcan
qualquier pecado lo faze,
mas a la Soberuia plaze
que las bien fechas perezcan⁸⁹;
pues conviene que padezcan
si vanagloria quisieron,
que lo que aquí mereçieron
acullá no lo merezcan.

616

LIV

“¡O vil triste ypocresía!
¡O doble cara dañosa,
red de sonbra religiosa,⁹⁰
encubierta truhanía!
Del ypócrita diría
ser momo de falsa cara,
que la encubre y la declara
so sinple filosomía.

624

LV*

“D’este tal se me figura
lo que del ético siento⁹¹,
quando avría buena cura
á del de mal conoçimiento;
pues finje⁹² por fundamento
no querer nada no dalle,
su remedio era curalle
con su mesmo regimiento.

632

LVI

“¡O cautela syngular
buscada por nuevos modos!
Por fazer engaño a todos
tú te dexas engañar;
ayunas por no ayunar,
por sobir alto te omillas;
no pidiendo grandes sillas,
las demanda tu callar.

640

LVII

“Avnque con la catadura
mansa tú me contradizes,
de falso buey de perdizes
as ypócrita figura,
pues tu piel e cobertura
y çençerro symulado,
al punto⁹³ d’auer caçado
se conuierte en su natura.

648

Concluye

LVIII*

“¿Quál gloria vana más çierta,
que la que cobra costunbre,⁹⁴
de la Soberuia cubierta
so velo de mansedunbre?
Quien finge la seruidunbre
de soberuiosa omildat,
no busca la claridad,
mas quiere buscar la lunbre.

656

⁸⁹ 05*MP-2: parezcan

⁹⁰ 05*MP-2: mentirosa

⁹¹ 05*MP-2: Lo que del ético siento / d’este tal me figura

⁹² 05*MP-2: sigue

⁹³ 05*MP-2: tiempo

⁹⁴ 05*MP-2: ¿Quál más errada costunbre / cuál vanagloria más cierta / que

LIX

“Auro que no sosiegas
buscando sotiles modos,
lo que tú robas de todos,
dime, ¿para quién lo allegas?
Tus riquezas tanto çiegas,
allegadas por mal arte,
¿a quién pueden fazer parte,
pues a ti mesmo las niegas?” 664

*Responde el Auariçia señalando çinco
fines por qué allega*

LX

“Claramente te confieso
que allego toda vez,
y por ser⁹⁵ en mi vejez
lo guardo mejor por eso;
ca este mundo traueso
por quien non se faze cura,
buelue su buena ventura
munchas vezes al avieso.” 672

LXI

“Y avn allego porque so,
por lo que tengo preçiado;
allego por ser vengado
de los que mal quiero yo;
allego porque do estó
soy franco quando conuiene,
ca si sé que bien me viene
algunas vegadas do.” 680

*Responde la Razón al primer fin, de la
vejez*

LXII*⁹⁶

“Locura grande sin falla
si nauegases sería⁹⁷
creçer en la vitualla
falleçiéndote la vía;
pues si d'esta razón mía
reçibes clara notiçia,
¿cómo creçes la cobdiçia
en la tu postremería?” 688

⁹⁵ 05*MP-2: por tener

⁹⁶ This stanza appears in MP3 and therefore is wrongly attributed to Olivares in 05*MP-2.

⁹⁷ 05*MP-2: Si nauegasses sería / locura grande sin falla

25

“Si nauegando la mar
començasse alteración,
di, Razón, ¿sería razón
que lleuasse que gastar?
Assí deues aplicar
pues de prudencia tenemos,
que si en tiempo proueemos
somos dignos de loar.” 696

26

“Qualquiera de mi consejo
temprano deue buscarlo,
y no esperar ganarlo
quando sea enfermo viejo.
Mientras edad tiene aparejo,
busque con que se mantenga,
y no qu'el consejo venga
después de ydo el conejo.” 704

27

“Enxemplo común formado
es en la gente menor,
que no falta al gastador
por mucho qu'aya gastado;
muy menos m'a mí faltado
pues no te me embí alguno,
qu'el refrán sería ninguno
si yo no ouiesse guardado.” 712

Replica la Razón (Juan)

LXIII

“Allegas, tú, porque temes
las bueltas del mundo çiego,
queriendo fuir su fuego,
te lanças donde te quemes;
no aprietan muchos xemes
lo que la cobdiçia abarca;
con muncho⁹⁸ lastre tu barca
çiará quando la remes.” 720

⁹⁸ 05*MP-2: tanto

LXIV

“Munchos fechos faze buenos
la Fortuna quando aplaza;
a los más, más amenaza,
es flaca contra lo menos;
tú que de bienes agenos,
por no temerla te çercas,
por fuyrla te le açercas
do más te lança sus truenos. 728

LXV

“Seguras del su combate
son las casas pobrezillas,
los palacios y las sillas
de los ricos más abate;
pónelos en tal debate⁹⁹
que no conoçen sosiego,
y quien tiene mejor juego
reçibe muy mayor mate.” 736

*Responde la Voluntad
(Jerónimo)*

28

“Tú huyes de tu presencia
según las cosas que dizes,
porque más las autorizes,
comparas con gracia y sciencia:
mas en tamaña indigencia
biuimos según s'alcança,
los moços por esperança,
los viejos con esperiencia. 744

29

“Ya te diré que quien tiene
riquezas, mil cosas haze;
desplaze a quien le desplaze,
da bien a quien bien le viene.
Amenaza si conuiene
e si s'ensaña, castiga;
él se altera y se mitiga
sin que lo ageno le agene. 752

30

“Pues no tomes en desdén
si de ser pobre rehuyo,
que ninguno da lo suyo
sin que doblado le den;
por cuya razón es bien
que yo por afán procure
riquezas, y que las cure,
pues no cura alguien de alguien.” 760

*Responde la Razón al terçero fin que
dixo que allegaua porqu'era preçiado
por lo que tenía*

LXVI (Juan)

“Porque tienes con afán,
eres preçiado me rezas,
son preçiadas tus riquezas,
que de ti non curarán;
por ellas todos lo an
y la muerte te rodean;
por ellas te la desean
y a las vezes te la dan. 768

LXVII

“Y porque tan invmanos
tus fechos sienten¹⁰⁰ con ellas,
todos dan de ti querellas,
así fijos como ermanos;
y tus parientes çercanos
desean de buena guerra
tener a ti so la tierra
y a lo tuyo entre sus manos. 776

LXVIII

“¿Qué farán tus enemigos?
que amigos con tus bienes
nin los fazes nin los tienes,
moços, viejos nin antiguos;
pero dexas por castigos
de ti muy viles indiçios;
dexas más de los tus viçios
munchos pobres por testigos”. 784

⁹⁹ 05*MP-2: rebate

¹⁰⁰ 05*MP-2: hazes

31

“Bien era si te plugiesse (*Jerónimo*)
 disputar sin tanta injuria;
 d’otro deue ser la furia,
 si Razón razón tuuiesse;
 razón es que Razón fuesse
 templada en lo que hablasse,
 y qu’ella se moderasse
 sin que nadie lo dicesse. 792

32

“Injúriasme porque sigo
 esta vida que mantengo;
 porque guardo lo que tengo,
 dizes que no tengo amigo;
 pues entre tanto enemigo
 quiero según has hablado
 rico ser y testiguado,
 más que pobre y ser testigo. 800

33

“Allende d’esto diría
 que quien socorre sin falla
 do más menester se halla
 mayor franqueza sería;
 tal caso contecería
 qu’el rico fuesse cayendo,
 pues allí yo socorriendo,
 no es auaricia la mía. 808

34

“Preguntas, ¿para qu’allego
 tanta riqueza y despojo?
 Para si me dan enojo,
 ya dixe, vengarme luego;
 y con tanto tras mi fuego,
 nadie no me enojará;
 si veo que bien m’está,
 más riquezas no las niego. 816

35

“Por vsar de tal officio
 busco bienes sin tardança;
 con ellos tomo vengança
 de qualquiera maleficio.
 Ves aquí porque cobdicio
 riquezas de que me cargo,
 y algunas vezes soy largo,
 avnque dizes auaricio.” 824

Responde la Razón (Juan)

LXIX

“Cobdiçias mucho tener
 por te vengar a la luenga;
 mucho más presto se venga
 quien no tiene qué perder;
 antes tu catiuo aver
 te faze puro couarde,
 y lo que no fazes tarde
 no estuuiera por fazer. 832

Responde la Razón a la quinta causa

LXX

“Con franqueza surretiçia
 no nos ciegues, auariento,
 ca si das veynte por çiento
 ya tu dádiua se viçia;
 y encubres con maliciã
 de vsurera sotileza,
 so espeçia de largueza
 la tu cruel auariçia. 840

Continúa

LXXI

“Ca franqueza avnque quisiese,
 aquella llamar no puedo,
 que te faze dar el miedo
 o prestar el interese;
 nin obra que se fiziese
 por lisonja o vanagloria
 te sería meritoria
 do caridat falleçiese. 848

Continúa

LXXII

“Tomas de franco figura,
 pero la forma non as,
 pues alquilas lo que das
 por boluerlo con vsura;
 ca la dádiua muy pura
 con su gracia t’aperçibe
 solo a pro del que reçibe,
 del tuyo no dando¹⁰¹ cura. 856

¹⁰¹ 05*MP-2: auiendo

Continúa más y concluye

LXXIII

“En verte dar tan syn aprieto
las cosas que tanto amas,
muchos piensan que derramas
y tú sienbras de secreto.
Pareçe blanco lo prieto
con la color de malicia,
mas largueza y auaricia
no caben en vn sujeto.” 864

Responde el Auaro (Jerónimo)

36

“Riquezas o son d’amar,
o no se deuen querer;
si ellas son d’aborreçer,
ninguna virtud es dar.
Si son d’amar y buscar,
d’aquí prouaría yo,
que pues amo lo que do,
muy digno soy de loar.” 872

Sigue

37

“Íten, o son bien por sí,
o son bien en mi respeto;
si son por sí bien perfeto
por esso las adquirí;
e si como proferí
en mi respeto lo son,
¿cómo quieres, tú, Razón,
que las deseche de mí?” 880

38

“Íten más, o es bien gastallas,
o su bien es tenellas;
si su bien es retenellas,
luego no yerro en guardallas.
E si tú, Razón, hallas
que gastarlas es su bien,
tú, no me des en desdén
para que gaste buscallas.” 888

Sigue

39

“Pues opinión no te ciegue,
ni tu nombre te peruierta,
ni justicia se nos vierta,
ni la verdad se nos niegue;
yo hallo qu’es bien qu’allegue
riquezas por muchos modos,
y por auerlas de todos
no descanse ni sossiegue.” 896

40

“E que con tal diligencia,
avnque me veas sedienta,
sotil y magra y hambrienta,
no t’espante mi apariencia,
que si bien coge Prudencia
las razones por nos dadas,
yo t’aseguro a osadas
que por mí dé la sentencia.” 904

Replica la Razón (Juan)

LXXIV

“Cada poeta en su foja
te dio forma de quien roba,
vno d’arpía, otro de loba;
tanto tu beuir enoja
y de virtud¹⁰² se despoja,
que de ti, triste mendiga,
conviene tanbién que diga
aquello que se m’antoja.” 912

Compara

LXXV

“Cocatriz es sola vna
animalia que te toca
en tener grande la boca
y salida no ninguna;
yo por la vista d’alguna,
me fundo por espirençia,
e digo qu’es la dolença
tuya y la d’esta comuna.” 920

¹⁰² 05*MP-2: verdad

*La Razón consejando cómo deue el que
reçibe ser gradeçido*

LXXVI

“Quien bien juega la pelota
jamás bote l’enbaraça,
antes mejor la rechaça
qu’el que juega gela bota;
reçibe d’aquesto nota
si bienes as reçebido,
ca por el desgradeçido
el grato a vezes escota. 928

LXXVII

“Digo porque si ouiste
graçiosos algunos bienes,
rechaçes de los que tienes
muy mejor que reçebiste;
si dizes que biues triste
por no poderlo fazer,
digo que no puede ser
que virtud en ti consiste. 936

LXXVIII

“Ca sy te fue denegada
por pobreza facultat,
no niegues tu voluntat¹⁰³
qu’es por fecho reputada;
presenta por¹⁰⁴ obligada
la tu entinçión pareja;
sólo el ánimo apareja
a quien no s’esconde nada.” 944

Habla la Razón contra la Luxuria

LXXIX

“¡O Luxuria, vil foguera,
de sufre mucho fedionda,
en todo tiempo cachonda
sin razón e sin manera!
¡Enemiga lastimera
de la santa castidat,
ofensa de onestidat
y de viçios eredera!” 952

Responde la Luxuria (Juan)¹⁰⁵

LXXXVII

“Con tus modos contrafechos
no me des tanto baldón;
pues que te llamas Razón,
ten por medio los derechos;
fallarás en los mis fechos,
si parar quisieres mientes,
por pocos inconuinientes
causados grandes prouechos. 960

LXXXVIII

“Como todo criatura
de muerte tome siniestro,
aquel buen Dios y maestro
reparó,¹⁰⁶ por tal figura,
que los daños que natura
de la tal muerte tomase,
Luxuria los reparase
con nueva progenitura. 968

LXXXIX

“Quando todo lo dispuso
sin aver mengua nin sobra,
gran deleyte en la tal obra
a todo linage puso,
porque por plazer del vso
de la tal generación,
durase la suçesyón
desde arriba fasta ayuso. 976

XC

“Por mi causa generante
y permisión diuinal,¹⁰⁷
todo linage mortal
dura en su semejante;¹⁰⁸
muere lo viuificante
la su materia no más,
dexando su fyn atrás,
toma comienço adelante. 984

¹⁰³ 05*MP-2: no niegas la voluntad

¹⁰⁴ 05*MP-2: es por absente obligada / la intención qu’es pareja

¹⁰⁵ Here I have arranged Mena’s stanzas in the order that Olivares chose and which is found in 05*MP-2 as well as in the Toledo 1548 and Anvers 1552 editions.

¹⁰⁶ 05*MP-2: “proueyó

¹⁰⁷ 05*MP-2: promisión general

¹⁰⁸ 05*MP-2: dura en el su semejante

XCI

“Por mí sola se repara
quanto destruye dolencia,
mar y fierro y pestilencia,
y de aquí quanto desuara;
por mí la vida muy cara
reçibe forma en que dura,
y por mí toda fechora¹⁰⁹
al su fazedor declara.” 992

Replica la Razón (Juan)

LXXX

“¡O largo repentimiento,
triste fin, breue deleyte,
fealdat, fondón d’afeyte,
pungituo pensamiento,
aviltado vençimiento,
abto diforme, escondido,
do el vençedor es vençido,
y el cobrar¹¹⁰ es perdimiento!” 1000

LXXXI

“Posponen con tu dolencia
los reyes su majestad,
los grandes su dinidat,
y los sabios su çiençia.
Tira la tu pestilencia
virtud a toda persona:
a las vírgines corona
y a las castas continencia.” 1008

Responde la Luxuria (Juan)

XCII

“No fagas mis fechos llenos
de daños tan crimosos;
si son algunos dañosos,
otros mucho fago buenos;
coteja con los agenos
mi pecado, y fallarás
quanto es en fama más
tanto ser¹¹¹ en culpa menos.” 1016

41

“Yo hago que se destroe (*Jerónimo*)
la suzia y torpe rudeza;
yo hago gala y franqueza
e Razón no lo conoce.
Hago al viejo que remoce,
hago al couarde esforçado,
hago paz entre el andado¹¹²
e la madrastra feroce.” 1024

Sigue

42

“Pues no sé porqué merezca
que injuriando me condenes,
siendo causa de mill bienes,
avunque a ti tal no parezca;
pues Razón, razón t’ofrezca
que loes el bien que tengo¹¹³
con quanto al mundo conuenga
porque luzca y permanezca.” 1032

Replica la Razón (Juan)

LXXXII*

“Tú te bruñes y te aluzias,
tú fazes con los tus males¹¹⁴
que las manos mucho suzias
traten linpios corporales;
muchos lechos maritales
de agenas pisadas huellas
y sienbras grandes querellas
en deudos tan prinçipales.” 1040

LXXXIII

“Das a las gentes vltajes
de muerte non las reseruas,
tú fallas las tristes yeruas,
tú los crueles potajes;
por ti los linpios linajes
son bastardos y no puros,
de claros fechos¹¹⁵ escuros
y de varones, saluajes.” 1048

¹⁰⁹ 05*MP-2: criatura

¹¹⁰ 05*MP-2 and Anvers 1552: vencer

¹¹¹ 05*MP-3: será

¹¹² Anvers 1552: andrado

¹¹³ Anvers 1552: tenga

¹¹⁴ 05*MP-2: Tú hazes con los tus males /
quando te bruñes y aluzias

¹¹⁵ 05*MP-2: hazes

LXXXIV*

“Tú fazes fijos mezuquinos
de agena casa erederos;¹¹⁶
pones los adulterinos
en lugar de verdaderos;
fazes con tus viles fueros
que por culpa de las madres
muchos fijos a sus padres
saluden por estrangeros. 1056

LXXXV

“La fuerça tú la destruyes,
los días tú los acortas,
quanto más tú te deportas
tanto más tu vida fuyes;
los sentidos diminuyes
e los ingenios ofuscas;
la beldat que tanto buscas
con tu causa la refuyes. 1064

LXXXVI

“¿Qué diré de tus maldades
sino que por ti perdidos
son reynos e destruydos,
sumidas grandes çiudades,
desfechas comunidades,
el viçio fecho costunbre,
y dadas en seruidunbre
muchas francas libertades?” 1072

El Auctor

XCIII

De cara tan dañadora,
la Razón ya despedida,
fatigada y afligida,
mas al cabo vençedora,
boluiendo como señora
el su jesto y continençia,
la Yra sin reuerençia,
le sobresale a desora. 1080

La Ira contra la Razón

XCIV

“No hagas – dize – tardança (*Juan*)
tú, Razón, nin grand arenga;
ca no quiere fabla luenga
nin dilación la vengança;
ni disimula esperança¹¹⁷
la¹¹⁸ injuria o vituperio;
esecuçión es misterio
que sin obra no s’alcança. 1088

XCV

“Ni espero yo asonadas
de muy dorados paueses,
ni granponadas¹¹⁹ arneses
ni crestas¹²⁰ mucho pintadas,
bacuquines¹²¹ nin çeladas
con tinbles, y mil enpachos,
y muy luzibles¹²² penachos
en cabeças engalladas. 1096

XCVI*

“Ny me fago yo memoria
de quanto supo fallar
el antigua vanagloria¹²³
y la nueua acreçentar;
pues que para me vengar
de los vltrajes vmanos,
sólo coraçón y manos
me conuiene demostrar. 1104

XCVII

“Nyn atiende la liçençia
del ronco son de la tronpa,
o la batalla que ronpa
porque incline¹²⁴ mi paçiençia;
nin guardo la difirençia
del sol partido por medio,
ni sufro darme remedio
de tregua nin conuiniençia. 1112

¹¹⁶ 05*MP-2: Hazes hijos herederos / d’ajena casa y mezuquinos

¹¹⁷ 05*MP-2: que no quita to ordenança

¹¹⁸ 05*MP-2: mi

¹¹⁹ 05*MP-2: acecaladas

¹²⁰ 05*MP-2: tiendas

¹²¹ 05*MP-2: capacetes

¹²² 05*MP-2: ni los luzientes

¹²³ 05*MP-2: Ni lo que supo hallar / el antigua vanagloria / d’ello me hago memoria / ni ...

¹²⁴ 05*MP-2: indigne

XCVIII

“Yrada siendo mi mano,
tan fuertes armas se falla,
como las faze Misalla
o las fiziera Vulcano;
al açidente çercano
de la mi yra sañosa,
armas le son toda cosa
que puede fallar a mano. 1120

Concluye

XCIX

“Déxanos¹²⁵ pues tú, Razón,
que según tu ordenança,
nin mi yra avrá vengança
nin mi mal satisfaçión;
nin la onrra del varón
por razón se satisfaze,
si emienda no se faze
del reçibido baldón.” 1128

Prosigue el estoria

C

Con paçiençia muy prudente
la Razón se refrenó
fasta que Yra gastó
su palabra y açidente;
apartado de presente
aquel su sañoso fuego,
la Razón comiença luego
a dezir muy mansamente: 1136

La Razón contra la Yra (Juan)

CI

“¡O quán mucho la tenprança
que te fallece te daña!
Teniendo d’otro la saña,
tomas de ti la vengança;
no riges por ordenança
los autos locos que fazes;
a quien te mira desplazes,
y aplazes a quien te alança. 1144

CII

“Tanto que yrada duras
eres tú locura breue;
es tu seso mucho lieue,
son diformes tus figuras;
para ver que son locuras
los tus súbitos denuedos,
nunca están tus mienbros quedos
ni tus façiones seguras. 1152

CIII*

“Dexa, Yra, los jüezes
dexa los reyes estar,¹²⁶
dexa los que tienen vezes
de regir y de mandar;
no los quieras alterar,
ca el justo coraçón
afeçiones y pasión
todo deue desechar. 1160

CIV*

“Aquella yra se aprueua
que inçita el coraçón,¹²⁷
no que lo lançe, mas mueua
a madura esecuçión;
entiéndase¹²⁸ esta razón
en castigo, en regimiento,
qu’en lo otro yo no siento
bien de su¹²⁹ alteraçión. 1168

CV

“Quanto más deues dexar
los que religión atacan
o los que siruen o tratan
el misterio del altar.
Quiere Dios familiar
apurado en toda cosa,
pues en çelda religiosa
paçiençia deue morar. 1176

¹²⁵ 05*MP-2: Dexemos

¹²⁶ 05*MP-2: Dexa, Yra, sin ti estar / los reyes y los juezes

¹²⁷ 05*MP-2: La yra qu’el coraçón / inçita aquella s’aprueua

¹²⁸ 05*MP-2, Toledo 1548 and Anvers 1552: entiéndese

¹²⁹ 05*MP-2: tu

CVI

“Açebtable sacifiçio
no es con yra reçevido;
el que pide no es oýdo
ni mirado su seruifiçio.

Si Dios tiene justo ofiçio,
¿cómo puede la persona
que su yra no perdona
ser perdonado su viçio?”

1184

Hasta aquí llegó Juan de Mena con esta su obra, la qual el dicho frey Jerónimo igualó en coplas, y corrigió el estilo. Y agora tracta de los otros tres vicios que quedaron por fazer, quando Juan de Mena murió, y hablando sobre su muerte, dize assí.

43

O muerte quando tú asomas
sobre toda criatura,
¿por qué con modo y mesura
tú ciegas furias no domas?
Tú, quando buscas que comas
en esta vida de quexas,
los que has de tomar dexas,
los que has de dexar tomas.

1192

47

Sin saber qué respondiesse
salteado aquella vez,
Prudencia como juez
mandó al cónclaue que oyesse
cómo Yra no tuuiesse
contra Razón resistencia,
mandó la sabia Prudencia
qu’el pleyto que procediesse.

1224

44

La suerte de tu çoçobra
no puedo loar por buena,
pues lleuarte a Juan de Mena
do tanto daño se cobra:
pues do tanta falta sobra
no sé yo en que concluya,
sino en llorar la muerte suya
o el no acabar de su obra.

1200

*La Razón contra la Gula***48**

“¡O Gula torpe vileza,
vicio de toda deshonrra!
tú deshonrras a quien t’onrra
y ensuzias toda limpieza:
auiltas la gentileza,
ningún bien veo que hagas,
todas edades estragas,
con infamia de nobleza.

1232

45

O tú muy claro poeta,
ruégote do quier que andes,
que al tu espíritu mandes
me guíe por vía recta:
sienta mi pluma indiscreta
de tu fauor tal ayuda,
que sabia torne de ruda
y esta fin haga perfecta.

1208

49

“¡O goloso, cuán notoria!
es la culpa en que has caydo,
qu’en ser de gula vencido
sientes crecida victoria;
sin auer de Dios memoria
hazes estos males dos,
del vientre tuyo tu dios,
e de tu garganta gloria.”

1240

46

Con el ruego que hazía
inpromptu m’apareció
lo que Juan de Mena vio
al tiempo que escreuía:
y él presente que dezía
“Jerónymo d’Olivares,
tus versos serán mis pares
si acabas la obra mía.”

1216

*Responde la Gula***50**

“No sea cólera adusta
tú razón mientras hablamos,
ni en esto que disputamos
te nos muestres tan robusta:
si a ti tu nombre te gusta
pregunto sin arrogancia,
entre la gana y sustancia,
¿Quién terná medida justa?

1248

51

“O como por menester,
o por plazer voluntario,
si porque m'es necessario
ningún vicio puede ser:
pues si es por complazer
do necesidad coarta,
allí do la gana es harta
allí intervino el plazer. 1256

52

“¿Cómo puedes tú tassar
el comer de los biuientes,
do tantos inconuenientes
se pueden considerar?
A vno solo vn manjar
es más de lo que le basta,
de otro su estómago gasta
más que tú le piensas dar. 1264

53

“No pienses que soy tan loca
que como más que conuiene,
mas quien grande gana tiene
mucha vianda l'es poca:
ni lo qu'entra por la boca
es lo qu'el ánima ensuzia,
mas lo que sale de huzia
que contra el próximo toca. 1272

54

“Muchas razones están
contrarias a tu opinión,
que si piensas qu'es razón
ellas te la negarán:
cata si de sólo pan
biuiera la criatura;
no nos diera la natura
por pan sólo tanto afán. 1280

Concluye.

55

“Pues, Razón, no nos assombres
con palabras iujuriosas
ni assí acrimines mis cosas,
dándome tales renombres;
por tanto, Razón, no nombres
culpa do culpa no está,
pues qualquiera juzgara
sin mí no biuir los hombres.” 1288

Comparación del auctor

56

Bien como haz'el cercado
si siente dentro la mina,
que se vela y contramina
por do piensa ser tomado:
bien assí el vicio infamado
de gula contraminó,
según las causas sintió
de que pudo ser culpado. 1296

Replica la Razón

57

“Con paladar más goloso
que pide ningún concierto,
te escondes de lo cierto,¹³⁰
del comer menesteroso:
pues no digas tú, vicioso,
glotón, suzio, abominable,
qu'en el comer razonable
aya juizio dubdoso. 1304

58

“No pienses gula parlera
d'esconder verdad tan clara:
si por ti no començara
muerte segunda no viera,
ni m'incites a que quiera
dezir tus disformidades,
vilezas y suziedades,
sin sazón y sin manera. 1312

59

“Quien deleyta su garganta,
puede ser dicho almicida:
él diminuye su vida,
la ley diuina quebranta:
pues ni finjas fuerça tanta
en los testos que no sabes,
que quien dize que allí cabes
testimonio te leuanta. 1320

¹³⁰ 05*MP-2:.' se tescondes tu delo cierto'
Probably a printing error.

Concluye

60

“A la he no harta colo
con sus soplos al ayuno,
ni de sólo pan ninguno
biue debaxo del polo;
ni es de Baco ni Apolo
dar la vida, ni ser puede
más del verbo que procede
de la boca de Dios sólo.” 1328

La Razón contra la Envidia

61

“¡O tú infernal postema
de penal ferocidad,
de la sancta caridad!
Enemiga muy extrema,
eres hoguera que quema
lo que tú misma cobdicias.
Pues siendo vicio, no vicias,
dime, Envidia, ¿qu’ es tu thema? 1336

62

“¡O embidioso cetrino
aborrecible en tus modos!
tu vicio da pena a todos
los que siguen tu camino.
¡O triste vicio mezquino
qué penas con bien ageno!
¿Quál día te será bueno
con tormento tan contínuo? 1344

63

“Tu vicio contino das
contra de lo que prometes
porque allí do tú te temes
gimiendo y llorando estás:
do quier que vienes o vas,
andas turbio y tribulado,
con tus penas muy penado
con glorias agenas más.” 1352

Responde la Voluntad

64

“¡O Razón y cuán molesto
las cosas, pues bien no entiendes!
Injuriando reprehendes
por modo no muy honesto,
pues deues mirar aquesto:
que por mí los que oy biuen,
siendo causa que s’abiuen
corrigen sus faltas presto. 1360

65

“Mi condición me guerrea
porque no suffre cosquilla,
lo qual me trae amarilla:
so sañosa y triste y fea.
No t’espante que tal sea
pues de mi plazer despueblo,
que conmigo gime el pueblo
quando el malo señorea. 1368

66

“Cata: yo soy la que muevo
los mancebos animosos,
a los actos virtuosos,
y a los ancianos renuevo.
Y por aquesto m’atreuo
al vicio que ves que sigo,
y si yerro en lo que digo
con el apóstol lo prueuo. 1376

67

“Muy destinta y muy agena
es la pena de la culpa,
y pues pena me desculpa
la culpa no me condena;
pues mi vicio me da pena.
De culpa soy sin cuydado:
si no culpa, no pecado;
si no pecado, soy buena. 1384

68

“Pues tú, no juzgues por falla
mi razón qu’ es tan notoria;
mi verdad tan perentoria
no sé quién pueda negalla.
Si no sientes esto, calla,
pon a tu lengua entredicho,
que si sientes lo que dicho
mi vicio virtud se halla. 1392

Concluye

69

“No hago habla más luenga;
loando quanto aprouecho,
por no perder su derecho
quien por su mano se venga.
Siente de la dicha arenga,
pues oýrle te fastidia:
¡qué tenga razón Embidia
y embidia la Razón tenga!”

1400

Replica la Razón

70

“¡O pecado irreparable,
vicio sin ningún deleyte,
gesto feo sin afeyte,
abusión abominable!
¡O pena muy incurable,
llena de dolor immenso!
Ni sé dezir lo que pienso,
ni tengo lengua que hable.

1408

71

“Los vicios tienen poder,
no te pese que lo diga
ca quien quiera que los siga
dan deleytable plazer:
mas tú no puedes hazer
a ti recebir plazer,
pues si para ti no eres
di, ¿para quién puedes ser?”

1416

72

Concluye

“Vete pecado impecible,
do nadie por ti no pene:
ni tu nombre jamás suene
en esta vida passible:
no nos seas más terrible
disputando de tal cosa,
pues eres a ti nojosa,
y a todos aborrescible.”

1424

La Razón contra la Pereza

73

“¡O vil pereza despierta,
alça la greña, y escucha!
Tu floxedad más que mucha,
tu negligencia muy cierta:
tú hazes qu'está¹³¹ tu puerta,
por no curarte de nada,
a los bienes muy cerrada,
a los males muy abierta.

1432

74

“Tu vicio escuro sin lumbre
llena de males con él,
yo no sé quién es aquél
que suffre tu pesadumbre,
tu negligente costumbre,
tu condición perezosa.
Tu vida passar ociosa,
es de vicios certidumbre.

1440

75

“Tú los vellacos sostienes,
tú los muy viciosas crías,
tú hazes cortos los días,
tú las noches nos detienes:
tú nos priuas de los bienes,
tú ninguna cosa gana,
tú de pura holgazana
ninguna holgança tienes.

1448

76

“¡O vicio disforme, vil,
sin sombra de bien alguno!
¡O vicio muy importuno
a la criança gentil!
¡O vicio más que ceuil!
si de los viciosos cuento,
los otros criaron ciento,
tú criaste más de mill.

1456

77

“Tú huyes de la virtud.
Tú los vicios nos impetras,
tú aborreces las letras,
deshonrras la senetud,
infamas la juuentud
de tus infames çoçobras,
tú guías todas tus obras
a porcal solicitud.”

1464

¹³¹ Anvers 1552: esté

Comparación del autor

78

Como el que está desuelado,
y por fuerça ha dormido,
que si el sueño l'an rompido
despierta desatinado,
y no bien en sí tornado,
responde, gime, y boceza,
assí hizo la Pereza
oyendo lo razonado. 1472

Responde la Pereza

79

“Déxame por Dios, Razón,
c' apenas sé qué te dizes;
busca con quien t' autorizes,
no te pene mi pasión:
con todos ten presunción
de victoriosa contienda,
mas comigo ten la rienda,
pues mis cosas otras son. 1480

80

“O Razón, ¿dime, qué quieres?¹³²
déxame, pues que te dexo:
no te quexes pues no quexo
de tu querer mis quereres.
Mis ningunos menesteres
nunca reciben engaño,
y a las vezes traen daño
tus solícitos aueres. 1488

81

“El polir el razonar
y toda cosa curial
si bien miras su metal
mil vezes puede dañar;
de mi holgazanear
y dessabrido atauío,
e si algún mal es el mío,
pues bien es de tolerar.¹³³ 1496

82

“Los otros vicios viciosos
con quien hasta aquí contiendes,
son si sus autos entiendes
con diligencia, dañosos:
los míos son vagarosos,
porqu'e visto entre las gentes
ser pobres los diligentes
y ricos los perezosos. 1504

83

“Si tú en fortuna pensases
quando buelue el negro viso
del su rostro etiopiso
es cierto que t'espantasses;
por do creo si mirasses
quán seguros son mis hechos,
los diligentes prouechos
por mis floxezas trocasses. 1512

84

“Muy claro está tu despecho,
muy claro está tu gran cargo,
muy claro está mi descargo,
muy claro mi leue lecho;
muy claro está mi derecho,
muy claro está cómo engañas,
muy claro está cómo dañas,
muy claro está mi prouecho. 1520

Concluye

85

“No quieras que más fablemos
contra ti los de mi parte
porque si en verdad no ay arte,
muy de verdad te vencemos.
Déxanos, y dexart'emos
avnqu'es nuestra la vitoria,
ni tú quieras nuestra gloria
pues la tuya no queremos.” 1528

Replica la Razón

86

“Calle, torpe floxedad
ni por tu habla procedas,
sino al tiempo que concedas
que yo tengo la verdad:
ni pienses que tu maldad
sea aquello que convenga,
avnque tu tardía arenga
muestre graue auctoridad. 1536

¹³² Anvers 1552: quieres

¹³³ Toledo 1548: de te loar

Concluye

87

“Ni las palabras compuestas
de vosotros más parezcan,
mas antes todas perezcan
por torpes y deshonestas,
ni las tuyas más molestas
buscan fengidas razones,
ni tus abominaciones
publique¹³⁴ más mis respuestas.” 1544

Habla el Auctor

88

Voluntad no respondía
ni la Razón replicaue,
el cónclaue ya esperaue
lo que Prudencia haría,
la qual, vista la porfía
ser en fin de lo propuesto,
en tono dulce y modesto
tales palabras dezía: 1552

Habla la Prudencia

89

“Si bien mirasse la gente
sus effectos y defectos,
con aquellos intelectos
que son possible y agente,
y si no fuesse absente
la Voluntad oportuna,
diría toda ninguna
esta contienda presente. 1560

90

“Porqu'en aquesta contienda
do la humanidad contiende,
quien offende y quien defiende
piensa que va justa senda;
mas el saber qu'esto emienda
vsa con sabia cautela,
vnas vezes del espuela
y otras vezes de la rienda. 1568

91

“Yo no quiero resumir
vuestros dichos ni argumentos,
pues sus fines y cimientos
buenos están de sentir:
ni quiero ver arguir
lo que por bueno no alabo,
quanto más qu'estoy al cabo
de quanto podréys dezir. 1576

92

“Y pues en mí permanece
el fin de vuestra discordia,
demos al biuir concordia
pues es lo que le fallece,
assí que, pues se m'ofrece
el tal cargo, yo diré
de lo qu'en vosotras sé
aquello que me parece. 1584

93

“Tú, Voluntad, sobresales
con tus gestos muy enormes:
en conformidad disformes,
en disformidad yguales:
quando vales menos vales,
pues de torpeza t'enllenas,
en siete diezes setenas
multiplicando tus males. 1592

94

“Tú, Razón, te sobretienes,
mucho contigo vniforme,
y al nombre tuyo conforme
dando siempre el bien que tienes:
la verdad tú la sostienes,
lo cierto tú lo terminas,
lo bueno tú lo encaminas;
tú multiplicas mil bienes. 1600

La Sentencia

95

“Y por quanto determino,
visto bien vuestro processo,
vuestro mérito y excessos,
vuestro tino y desatino,
y por sentencia os asino
que la Voluntad perezca,
y la Razón permanezca,
pues nos guía al bien diuino. 1608

¹³⁴ Anvers 1552: publiquen

96

“Mi dezir no se contrasta
pues que temor ni esperança
han torcido la balança
do la justicia se gasta.
Mi sentencia queda casta:
si bien lo sentís las dos,
pues a qualquiera de vos
vuestro nombre sólo os basta.” 1616

Habla el auctor y da fin a la obra

97

Desque las dos escucharon
la mi prudente sentencia,
dada ya por la Prudencia
punto ni más altercaron;
mas luego s’aparejaron
al camino que truxeron;
en la forma que vinieron
d’essa misma se tornaron. 1624

Deo gracias.
Emprimióse con licencia de los
veedores diputados.

Bibliography

- ALVAR, Manuel, ed., 1965. *Libro de la infancia y muerte de Jesús (Libre dels tres reys d'orient)* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).
- ÁLVAREZ GATO, Juan, 1928. *Obras completas*, ed. Jenaro Artiles Rodríguez (Madrid: Compañía Ibero-Americana de Publicaciones).
- ÁLVAREZ PELLITERO, Ana María, ed., 1990. *Teatro medieval* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe).
- ARCHER, Robert, 1985. *The Pervasive Image* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins).
- _____, 1996. *Aproximació a Ausiàs March* (Barcelona: Editorial Empúries).
- _____, ed., 2001. *Misoginia y defensa de las mujeres. Antología de textos medievales* (Madrid: Cátedra).
- _____, 2011. *La cuestión odiosa: La mujer en la literatura hispánica tardomedieval* (Valencia: Institució Alfons el Magnànim).
- _____, 2011. "Un código desconocido del *Doctrinal de los cavalleros* de Alfonso de Cartagena", *Tirant*, 14: 59-71.
- ATLEE, Carl W., 2007. "A reassessment of the Satirical Nature of Gómez Manrique's *Coplas para Diego Arias de Ávila*", *La corónica* 35: 173-207.
- _____, 2010. "Political Protest in Gómez Manrique's Defunzió del noble cauallero Garçia Laso de la Vega", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 87: 169-85.
- AVERÇÓ, Luis de, 1952. *Torcimany*, ed. José María Casas Homs (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).
- AZAUSTRE GALIANA, Antonio and CASAS RIGALL, Juan, 1997. *Manual de retórica española* (Barcelona: Editorial Ariel).
- BAENA, Juan Alfonso de, 1966. *Cancionero*, ed. José María Azáceta (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).
- BATTESTI-PELEGRIN, Jeanne, 1990. "Les Poètes Convers et le Pouvoir: le Débat Poétique entre Gómez Manrique et Juan de Valladolid" in *Écrire à la Fin du Moyen-Âge. Le Pouvoir et l'Écriture en Espagne et en Italie (1450-1530)* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications Université de Provence), 241-251.
- BECEIRO PITA, Isabel, 1985. "La Biblioteca del conde de Benavente a mediados del siglo XV y su relación con las mentalidades y usos nobiliarios de la época" in *Estudios en memoria del Profesor D. Salvador de Moxó*, 1, ed. M.A. Ladero Quesada (Madrid: Universidad Complutense), 135-145.

- BLÜHER, Karl, 1983. *Séneca en España: investigaciones sobre la recepción de Séneca en España desde el siglo XIII hasta el siglo XVII* (Madrid: Gredos).
- BOASE, Roger, 1978. *The Troubadour Revival* (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul).
- BURRUS, Victoria A., 1998. "Role Playing in the Amatory Poetry of the *Cancioneros*", in *Poetry at Court in Trastamara Spain: From the Cancionero de Baena to the Cancionero General*, ed. E. Michael Gerli and Julian Weiss (Tempe, Arizona: Medieval Texts and Studies), 111-133.
- CAMACHO GUIZADO, Eduardo, 1969. *La elegía funeral en la poesía española*. (Madrid: Gredos).
- CANTERA BURGOS, Francisco, 1970. *El poeta Ruy Sánchez Cota y su familia de judíos conversos* (Madrid: Universidad de Madrid – Facultad de Filosofía y Letras).
- CAPRA, Daniela, 1992. "La renovación del diálogo en las 'Preguntas y Respuestas' de Gómez Manrique", *Romance Quarterly*, Vol. 39, 2: 185-198.
- CARRIÓN, Manuel, ed., 1978. "Gómez Manrique y el protonotario Lucena. Dos cartas con memoria de Jorge Manrique", *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, LXXXI: 565-582.
- CARTAGENA, Teresa de, 1967. *Arboleda de los enfermos. Admiración operum Dey*, ed. Lewis G. Hutton (Madrid: Real Academia Española).
- CASAS RIGALL, Juan, 1995. *Agudeza y retórica en la poesía amorosa de cancionero* (Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela).
- CASTROJERIZ, Juan de, 1947. *Glosa castellana al Regimiento de príncipes*, 3 vols., ed. Juan Beneyto Reyes (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos).
- CÁTEDRA, Pedro M., ed., 2001. *Tratados de amor en el entorno de Celestina* (Madrid: Sociedad Estatal España Nuevo Milenio).
- CHAS AGUIÓN, Antonio, 2002. *Preguntas y respuestas en la poesía cancioneril castellana* (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española).
- COLONNA, Guido de, 1970. *La Corónica Troyana: a Medieval Spanish Translation of Guido de Colonna's Historia Destructionis Troiae*, ed. Frank Pelletier Norris II (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press).
- CONDE SOLARES, Carlos, 2009. *El Cancionero de Herberay y la corte literaria de Juan II de Navarra* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Arts and Social Sciences Academic Press).
- CONTRERAS JIMÉNEZ, María Eugenia, 1985. "Diego Arias Dávila en la tradición y en la historia", *Anuario de estudios medievales*, 15: 475-495.

- COSTA, Marithelma, 2000. "La contienda poética entre Juan de Valladolid, el comendador Román y Antón de Montoro", *Cahiers de Linguistique Hispanique Médiévale*, 23: 27-50.
- Crónica anónima de Enrique IV de Castilla*, 1991. 2 vols., ed. María Pilar Sánchez-Parra (Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre).
- CUMMINGS, John G., 1973. "Pero Guillén de Segovia y el Ms. 4114", *Hispanic Review*, 41: 6-32.
- CURTIUS, Ernst Robert, 1979. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- DÍAZ ROIG, Mercedes, ed., 1976. *El romancero viejo* (Madrid: Cátedra).
- DEYERMOND, Alan, 1987. "La defunción del noble cavallero Garcilaso de la Vega", *Dicenda*, VI: 93-112.
- _____, 1998. "Women and Gómez Manrique" in *Cancionero Studies in Honour of Ian MacPherson* (London: Dept. of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary and Westfield College), 69-87.
- DISNEY, A. R., 2009. *A History of Portugal and the Portuguese Empire*, 2 vols. (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- DOMÍNGUEZ, Frank A., 1988. *Love and Remembrance: The Poetry of Jorge Manrique* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky).
- DRAGONETTI, Roger, 1960. *La Technique Poétique des Trouvères dans la Chanson Courtoise* (Bruges: De Tempel).
- DUFFELL, Martin J., 2007. *Syllable and Accent: Studies on Medieval Hispanic Metrics* (London: Department of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary University of London).
- DUTTON, Brian, ed., 1990-1991. *El cancionero del siglo XV: c.1360-1520*, 7 vols. (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca).
- An Electronic Corpus, 2007: An Electronic Corpus of 15th Century Castilian Cancionero Manuscripts*, ed. Dorothy S. Severin, F. Maguire, M. Moreno, B. Bordalejo, [and B. Dutton], <http://cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk>.
- ELLIOT, J. H., 2002. *Imperial Spain, 1469-1716*, London: Penguin Books.
- ENRÍQUEZ DEL CASTILLO, Diego, 1994. *Crónica de Enrique IV*, ed. Aureliano Sánchez Martín (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid).
- FERRER, Francesc, 1989. *Obra completa*, ed. Jaume Auferil (Barcelona: Barcino).
- GATIEN-ARNOULT, M. ed., 1841-1843. *Las Flors de Gay Saber, estier dichas Las Leys d'amor* (Toulouse).

- GAUME, Jean Joseph, 1882. *Life of the Good Thief. Done into English by M. De Lisle* (London).
- GERLI, E. Michael, 1996. "Performing Nobility: Mosén Diego de Valera and the Poetics of *Converso* Identity", *La corónica* 25, 1: 19-36.
- GIMENO CASALDUERO, Joaquín, 1975. *Estructura y diseño en la literatura castellana medieval* (Madrid: Porrúa).
- GITLITZ, David, 1996. *Los Arias de Segovia: entre la sinagoga y la iglesia* (San Francisco: International Scholars' Publications).
- GÓMEZ MORENO, Ángel, 1991. *El teatro medieval castellano en su marco romántico* (Madrid: Taurus Ediciones).
- GRIFFIN, Clive, 1991. *Los Cromberger: la historia de una imprenta del siglo XVI en Sevilla y México* (Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica, Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericano; Madrid: Sociedad Estatal Quinto Centenario).
- GUILLÉN DE SEGOVIA, Pero, 1989. *Obra poética*, ed. Carlos Moreno Hernández (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española).
- HUIZINGA, J., 1965. *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (London: Peregrine Books).
- JOHNSTON, Mark D., 1998. "Cultural Studies on the *Gaya Ciencia*" in *Poetry at Court in Trastamaran Spain: From the Cancionero de Baena to the Cancionero general*, ed. E. Michael Gerli and Julian Weiss (Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies), 235-253.
- KAMEN, Henry, 1985. *Inquisition and Society in Spain: in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Weidenfield and Nicholson).
- KAPLAN, Gregory B., 1996. "Toward the Establishment of a Christian Identity: the *Conversos* and Early Christian Humanism", *La corónica*, 25: 53-68.
- _____, 1996. "Rodrigo Cota's *Diálogo entre el Amor y un Viejo: A Converso Lament*", *Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literatures*, 8: 7-30.
- LAPESA, Rafael, 1988. *De Ayala a Ayala. Estudios literarios y estilísticos* (Madrid: Istmo).
- LIDA DE MALKIEL, María Rosa, 1984. *Juan de Mena, poeta del prerrenacimiento español* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México).
- LISS, Peggy K., 1992. *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- LÓPEZ DE AYALA, Pero, 2000. *Rimado de Palacio*, ed. H.Salvador Martínez (Washington: Peter Lang).

- LÓPEZ ESTRADA, Francisco, 1979. *Introducción a la literatura medieval española* (Madrid: Gredos).
- _____, 1984. “La Representación del nacimiento de Nuestro Señor de Gómez Manrique. Estudio textual”, *Segismundo*, 39-40: 9-30.
- McCLURE, GEORGE W., 1991. *Sorrow and Consolation in Italian Humanism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- MacKAY, Angus, 1977. *Spain in the Middle Ages: from Frontier to Empire, 1000-1500* (London: MacMillan).
- _____, 1981. *Money, Prices and Politics in Fifteenth-Century Castile* (London: Royal Historical Society).
- MANRIQUE, Gómez, 1885-1886. *Cancionero*, 2 vols., ed. Antonio Paz y Melia. (Madrid: Imprenta A. Pérez Dubrull).
- _____, 1947. *Regimiento de príncipes*, ed. Augusto Cortina (Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe).
- _____, 2003. *Cancionero*, ed. Francisco Vidal González (Madrid: Cátedra).
- MARCH, Ausiàs, 1997. *Obra completa*, ed. Robert Archer (Barcelona: Editorial Barcanova).
- MARINO, Nancy F., 2003. “La Relación entre historia y poesía: el caso de La Esclamación e querella de la gouernación de Gómez Manrique” in *Propuestas teórico-metodológicas para el estudio de la literatura hispánica medieval*, ed. Lillian von der Walde Moheno (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma de México), 211-225.
- MÁRQUEZ VILLANUEVA, Francisco, 1960. *Investigaciones sobre Juan Álvarez Gato* (Madrid: Anejo del Boletín de la Real Academia Española).
- _____, 1982. “‘Jewish Fools’ of the Spanish Fifteenth Century”, *Hispanic Review*, 50: 385-409.
- MARTÍN DE CÓRDOBA, 1974. *Jardín de nobles doncellas*, ed. Harriet Goldberg (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
- MENA, Juan de, 1505? *Coplas de los siete pecados mortales* (Sevilla: Jacobo Cromberger).
- _____, 1548. *Copilación de todas las obras del famosísimo poeta Iuan de Mena* (Toledo: Fernando de Santa Catalina).
- _____, 1552. *Las trezientas d’el poeta Iuan de Mena, glosadas por F. Núñez. Tratado de vicios y virtudes (glosado y acabado por I. de Olivares). Todo corregido* (Anvers).
- _____, 1982. *Coplas de los siete pecados mortales and First Continuation*, ed. Gladys M. Rivera (Madrid: Porrúa).

- ____, 1996. *La Iliada de Homero: edición crítica de las “Sumas de la Yliada de Homero” y del original latino, reconstruido, acompañada de un glosario latino-romance*, ed. Tomás Gonzalo Rolán, María F. Barrio Vega and A. López Fonseca (Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas).
- ____, 1997. *Laberinto de fortuna*, ed. Maxim P.A.M. Kerkhof (Madrid: Castalia).
- MENDOZA, Fray Íñigo de, 1968. *Cancionero*, ed. Julio Rodríguez-Puértolas (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe).
- MENDOZA NEGRILLO, Juan de Dios, 1973. *Fortuna y providencia en la literatura castellana del siglo XV* (Madrid: Real Academia Española).
- MONTORO, Antón de, 1990. *Poesía completa*, ed. Marithelma Costa (Cleveland: Cleveland State University Press).
- MORENO HERNÁNDEZ, Carlos, 1985. “Pedro Guillén de Segovia y el círculo de Alfonso Carrillo”, *Revista de Literatura*, XLVII, 94: 17-45.
- NADER, Helen, 1979. *The Mendoza Family in the Spanish Renaissance, 1350-1550* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press).
- NIRENBERG, David, 2006. “Figures of Thought and Figures of Flesh; ‘Jews’ and ‘Judaism’ in Late-Medieval Spanish Poetry and Politics”, *Speculum*, 81: 398-426.
- OROPESA, Alonso de, 1979. *Lumen ad revelationem gentium et gloria plebis Israel*, trans. Luis A. Díaz y Díaz (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca).
- PALENCIA, Alonso de, 1998-1999. *Gesta Hispaniensia ex annalibus suorum dierum collecta*, 2 vols., ed. Brian Tate and Jeremy Lawrance (Madrid: Real Academia de Historia).
- PARRILLA GARCÍA, Carmen, 1986. “Dos cartas inéditas en la Biblioteca Colombina”, *Epos*, 2: 341-350.
- PÉREZ DE GUZMÁN, Fernán, 1965. *Generaciones y semblanzas*, ed. R.B.Tate (London: Tamesis Books).
- PÉREZ LÓPEZ, José Luis, 1994. “Un poeta de cancionero sobrino del marqués de Santillana, Pedro de Mendoza, señor de Almazán” in *Actas del III congreso de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca), 767-779.
- PÉREZ PRIEGO, Miguel Ángel ed., 1990. *Poesía femenina en los cancioneros* (Madrid: Castalia & Instituto de la Mujer).
- PESCADOR DEL HOYO, María del Carmen, 1972-1973. “Aportaciones al estudio de Juan Álvarez Gato”, *Anuario de estudios medievales*, 8: 305-347.

- PULGAR, Fernando del, 1943. *Crónica de los reyes católicos*, 2 vols. ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe).
- _____, 1971. *Claros varones de Castilla*, ed. Robert Brian Tate (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- RIVERA, Gladys M., ed., 1982. *Coplas de los siete pecados and First Continuation* (Madrid: Porrúa).
- RIVERA GARRETAS, María-Milagros, 2004. *Juana de Mendoza (ca. 1425-1493)* (Madrid: Ediciones del Orto).
- RODRÍGUEZ GARCÍA, José María, 2005. "Poetry and Penal Practices in Late Fifteenth-Century Toledo", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 35,2: 245-288.
- RODRÍGUEZ-PUÉRTOLAS, Julio, ed., 1981. *Poesía crítica y satírica del siglo XV* (Madrid: Castalia).
- RODRÍGUEZ VELASCO, Jesús D., 1996. *El debate sobre la caballería en el siglo XV: la tratadística caballeresca en su marco* (Salamanca: Junta de Castilla y León).
- ROJAS, Fernando de, 1988. *La Celestina: Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, ed. Dorothy S. Severin (Madrid: Cátedra).
- _____, 2007. *La Celestina: Comedia o Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, ed. Peter E. Russell (Madrid: Castalia).
- ROUND, Nicholas G., 1962. "Renaissance Culture and its Opponents in Fifteenth-century Castile", *Modern Language Review*, LVII: 204-215.
- _____, 2013. "Gómez Manrique's *Exclamación e querella de la governación*: Poem and Commentary" in *Medieval Hispanic Studies in Memory of Alan Deyermond*, ed. Andrew M. Beresford, Louise M. Haywood and Julian Weiss (Woodbridge: Tamesis), 149-174.
- RUBIO GONZÁLEZ, Lorenzo, 1984. "Juan de Valladolid: un poeta de juglaría en el siglo XV", *Castilla: Boletín del departamento de filología española*, 6-7: 101-112.
- RUIZ Juan, 1988. *Libro de buen amor*, ed. G.B. Gybbon-Monypenny (Madrid: Castalia).
- SALINAS, Pedro, 1947. *Jorge Manrique o tradición y originalidad* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamérica).
- SANTILLANA, marqués de (MENDOZA, Íñigo López de), 1984. *Prohemios y cartas literarias*, ed. Miguel Garci-Gómez (Madrid: Editora Nacional).
- _____, 2003. *Poesías completas*, ed. Maxim P. A. M. Kerkhof and Ángel Gómez Moreno (Madrid: Castalia).

- SCHOLBERG, Kenneth R., 1971. *Sátira e invectiva en la España medieval* (Madrid: Gredos).
- _____, 1984. *Introducción a la poesía de Gómez Manrique* (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies).
- SENECA, 1932. *Moral Essays*, trans. John W. Basore (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press).
- _____, 1969. *Letters from a Stoic*, trans. Robin Campbell (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books).
- SIEBER, Harry, 1965. "Dramatic Symmetry in Gómez Manrique's *La Representación del nacimiento de Nuestro Señor*", *Hispanic Review* XXXIII: 451-470.
- _____, 1989. "Narrative Elegiac Structure in Gómez Manrique's *Defunción del noble cavallero Garci Laso de la Vega*" in *Studies in Honor of Bruce Wardropper*, ed. Dian Fox, Harry Sieber, Robert Horst (Newark Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta), 279-290.
- _____, 1993. "Gómez Manrique's Last Poem" in *Letters and Society in Fifteenth-Century Spain*, ed. Alan Deyermond and Jeremy Lawrance (Llangrannog: The Dolphin Book Company), 153-163.
- SIGÜENZA, José de, 1907-1909. *Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo*, vol. I (Madrid: Bailly-Baillière).
- SUÁREZ FERNÁNDEZ, Luis, CANELLAS LÓPEZ, Ángel & VICENS VIVES, Jaime, 1964. *Los Trastámaras de Castilla y Aragón en el siglo XV* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe).
- SURTZ, Ronald E., 1983. *Teatro medieval castellano* (Madrid: Taurus Ediciones).
- TORROELLA, Pere, 2004. *Obra completa*, ed. Robert Archer (Soveria Mannelli: Fondazione Rubbettino).
- VALERA, Diego de, 1941. *Memorial de diversas hazañas. Crónica de Enrique IV*, ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe).
- _____, 1959. *Espejo de la verdadera nobleza* in *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* (Madrid: Atlas).
- VIDAL GONZÁLEZ, Francisco, 2000. "Itinerario literario de Gómez Manrique: su primera etapa" in *Proceedings of the Ninth Colloquium* (London: Department of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary and Westfield College), 201-210.
- VILLENA, Enrique de, 1993. *Arte de trovar*, ed. F. J. Sánchez Cantón (Madrid: Visor Libros).
- WEISS, Julian, 1990. *The Poet's Art Literary Theory in Castile c.1400-1460* (Oxford: The Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature).

____, 2002. “¿Qué demandamos de las mugeres?” in *Gender and Debate from the Early Middle Ages to the Renaissance*, ed. Thelma S. Fenster and Clare A. Lees (Basingstoke: Palgrave), 237-281.

WEISSBERGER, Barbara, F., 2004. *Isabel Rules Constructing Queenship, Wielding Power* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

ZIMIC, Stanislav, 1977. “El teatro religioso de Gómez Manrique (1412-1491)”, *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, LVII: 353-400.